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Summary
At 2:45 in the afternoon on May 22, 2013, a devastating tornado touched down in the suburbs of Oklahoma City. The 1.3-mile-wide tornado plowed a 17-mile path through the community, leaving piles of rubble and debris where minutes earlier homes, schools, hospitals, and businesses had been standing. Wind speeds reached as high as 210 miles per hour. By the time the storm lifted 50 minutes later, a large part of Moore, Oklahoma, and other nearby cities had been destroyed. More than 12,000 homes were damaged, many of them completely obliterated by the storm. Twenty-four people were dead, including 10 children.

In the days that followed, residents discovered the extent of their losses, considered how their lives were changed, and helped those who had lost the most. While the community grieved, condolences and concern for the victims and their families poured in from public officials and citizens from across the country.

Powerful events have a way of bringing out similar reactions in people. Someone might point to this tragedy to illustrate how much alike each of us really is, how all people are basically the same. Yet if we look a little more closely, even in this situation we can see that not everyone reacted in the same way. Some people joined rescue teams to search through the piles of bricks and boards. Others pitched tents on their lawns vowing to protect what remained of their possessions. Some opened their homes to strangers who no longer had a home of their own. Others expressed anger at officials who had failed to build storm shelters in the basements of the elementary schools where children had died. Some dropped off food, clothing, diapers, and checks at quickly assembled donation centers. Others struggled to cope with the emotional aftermath of the storm and a growing sense of helplessness. Many turned to religion to find meaning and comfort, but some struggled to find the hand of God in so much suffering. Some residents who had lost everything vowed to rebuild. Others decided it was time to leave.

In many ways, the reactions to the Oklahoma tornado are typical of people who are suddenly thrown into a unique and tragic situation. At first, the demands of the situation overwhelm individual differences, but soon each person’s characteristic way of dealing with the situation and the emotional aftermath begins to surface. The more we look, the more we see that people are not all alike. The closer we look, the more we begin to see differences among people. These characteristic differences are the focus of this book. They are part of what we call personality. Moreover, personality psychologists have already studied many of the topics and issues that surfaced in the Oklahoma tragedy. Coping with stress, emotions, religion, anxiety, feelings of helplessness, and many other relevant topics are covered in various places in this book.

The Person and the Situation

Is our behavior shaped by the situation we are in or by the type of person we are? In the Oklahoma tornado tragedy, did people act the way they did because of the events surrounding them, or were their reactions more the
result of the kind of people they were before the incident? This is one of the enduring questions in psychology. The generally agreed-upon answer today is that both the situation and the person contribute to behavior. Certainly we don’t act the same way in all situations. Depending on where we are and what is happening, each of us can be outgoing, shy, aggressive, friendly, depressed, frightened, or excited. But it is equally apparent that not everyone at the same party, the same ball game, or the same shopping center behaves identically. The debate among psychologists has now shifted to the question of how the situation influences our behavior as well as how our behavior reflects the individual.

We can divide the fields of study within psychology along the answer to this question. Many psychologists concern themselves with how people typically respond to environmental demands. These researchers recognize that not everyone in a situation reacts the same. Their goal is to identify patterns that generally describe what most people will do. Thus a social psychologist might create different situations in which participants encounter someone in need of help. The purpose of this research is to identify the kinds of situations that increase or decrease helping behavior, but personality psychologists turn this way of thinking completely around. We know there are typical response patterns to situations, but what we find more interesting is why Peter tends to help more than Paul, even when both are presented with the same request.

You may have heard the axiom, “There are few differences between people, but what differences there are, really matter.” That tends to sum up the personality psychologists’ viewpoint. They want to know what makes you different from the person sitting next to you. Why do some people make friends easily, whereas others are lonely? Why are some people prone to bouts of depression? Can we predict who will rise to the top of the business ladder and who will fall short? Why are some people introverted, whereas others are so outgoing? Each of these questions is explored in this book. Other topics covered include how your personality is related to hypnotic responsiveness, reactions to stress, how well you do in school, and even your chances of having a heart attack.

This is not to say that situations are unimportant or of no interest to personality psychologists. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 7, many of the questions posed by personality researchers concern how a certain kind of person behaves in a particular situation. However, the emphasis of this book is on what makes you different from the next person—that is, your personality. Before addressing that question, let’s start by defining “personality.”

Defining Personality

Anyone who has been in college a while can probably anticipate the topic of the first lecture of the term. The philosophy professor asks, “What is philosophy?” The first class meeting in a communication course centers on the question, “What is communication?” Those who teach geography, history, and calculus have similar lectures. And so, for traditional and practical reasons, psychology professors too begin with the basic question, “What is personality?”
Although a definition follows, bear in mind that psychologists do not agree on a single answer to this question. In fact, personality psychologists are engaged in an ongoing and perhaps never-ending discussion of how to describe human personality and what topics belong within this subfield of psychology (Mayer, 2005; McAdams & Pals, 2006). As you will see, each personality theorist covered in this book also has a different idea about what personality psychologists ought to study. Whereas one theorist points to unconscious mechanisms, another might look at learning histories, and still another at the way people organize their thoughts. Although some students might find this lack of agreement frustrating, let me suggest from the outset that these different viewpoints provide a rich and exciting framework within which to explore the complexities of the individual.

**Personality** can be defined as *consistent behavior patterns and intrapersonal processes originating within the individual.* Several aspects of this simple definition need elaboration. Notice that there are two parts to it. The first part is concerned with consistent patterns of behavior. Personality researchers often refer to these as *individual differences.* The important point here is that personality is *consistent.* We can identify these consistent behavior patterns across time and across situations. We expect someone who is outgoing today to be outgoing tomorrow. Someone who is competitive at work is also quite likely competitive in sports. We acknowledge this consistency in character when we say, “It was just like her to do that” or “He was just being himself.” Of course, this does not mean an extraverted person is boisterous and jolly all the time, on solemn occasions as well as at parties. Nor does it mean people cannot change. But if personality exists and behavior is not just a reflection of whatever situation we find ourselves in, then we must expect some consistency in the way people act.

The second part of the definition concerns intrapersonal processes. In contrast to *interpersonal* processes, which take place between people, intrapersonal processes include all the emotional, motivational, and cognitive processes that go on inside of us that affect how we act and feel. Thus, you will find that many personality psychologists are interested in topics like depression, information processing, happiness, and denial.

It also is important to note that, according to the definition, these consistent behavior patterns and intrapersonal processes originate within the individual. This is not to say that external sources do not influence personality. Certainly the way parents raise their children affects the kind of adults the children become. And, of course, the emotions we experience are often a reaction to the events we encounter. The point is that behavior is not solely a function of the situation. The fear we experience while watching a frightening movie is the result of the film, but the different ways we each express or deal with that fear come from within.

### Six Approaches to Personality

What are the sources of consistent behavior patterns and intrapersonal processes? This is the basic question asked by personality theorists and researchers. One reason for the length of this book is that personality
psychologists have answered this question in many different ways. To help make sense of the wide range of personality theories proposed over the past century, we’ll look at six general approaches to explaining personality. These are the psychoanalytic approach, the trait approach, the biological approach, the humanistic approach, the behavioral/social learning approach, and the cognitive approach. Although the fit is not always perfect, each of the major theories of personality can be placed into one of these six general approaches.

Why so many theories of personality? Let me answer this question by way of analogy. Nearly everyone has heard the story about the five blind men who encounter an elephant. Each feels a different part of the animal and then tries to explain to the others what an elephant is like. The blind man feeling the leg describes the elephant as tall and round. Another feels the ear and claims an elephant is thin and flat, whereas another, holding onto the trunk, describes the animal as long and slender. The man feeling the tail and the one touching the elephant’s side have still different images. The point to this story, of course, is that each man knows only a part of the whole animal. Because there is more to the elephant than what he has experienced, each man’s description is correct but incomplete.

In one sense, the six approaches to personality are analogous to the blind men. That is, each approach does seem to correctly identify and examine an important aspect of human personality. For example, psychologists who subscribe to the psychoanalytic approach argue that people’s unconscious minds are largely responsible for important differences in their behavior styles. Other psychologists, those who favor the trait approach, identify where a person might lie along a continuum of various personality characteristics. Psychologists advocating the biological approach point to inherited predispositions and physiological processes to explain individual differences in personality. In contrast, those promoting the humanistic approach identify personal responsibility and feelings of self-acceptance as the key causes of differences in personality. Behavioral/social learning theorists explain consistent behavior patterns as the result of conditioning and expectations. Those promoting the cognitive approach look at differences in the way people process information to explain differences in behavior.

It’s tempting to suggest that by combining all six approaches we can obtain the larger, accurate picture of why people act the way they do. Unfortunately, the blind men analogy can only be stretched so far. Although different approaches to a given question in personality often vary only in emphasis—with each providing a legitimate, compatible explanation—in many instances the explanations from two or more approaches may be entirely incompatible. Thus people who work in the field often align themselves with one or another of the six approaches as they decide which of the competing explanations makes the most sense to them.

Returning to the blind men and the elephant, suppose someone were to ask how an elephant moves. The man feeling the trunk might argue that the elephant slithers along the ground like a snake. The man holding the elephant’s ear might disagree, saying that the elephant must fly like a bird with its big, floppy wings. The man touching the leg would certainly have a
different explanation. Although in some instances more than one of these explanations might be accurate (for example, a bird can both walk and fly), it should be obvious that at times not every theory can be right. It also is possible that one theory may be correct in describing one part of human personality, whereas another theory may be correct in describing other aspects.

No doubt some theories will resonate with you more than others. But it is worth keeping in mind that each approach has been developed and promoted by a large number of respected psychologists. Although not all of these men and women are correct about every issue, each approach has something of value to offer in our quest to understand what makes each of us who we are.

**Two Examples: Aggression and Depression**

To get a better idea of how the six approaches to understanding personality provide six different, yet legitimate, explanations for consistent patterns of behavior, let’s look at two common examples. Aggressive behavior and the suffering that comes from depression are widespread problems in our society, and psychologists from many different perspectives have looked into their causes.

**Example 1: Aggression**

Unfortunately, there is no shortage of people who consistently engage in aggressive behavior. People arrested for assault typically have a history of violence that goes back to playground fights in childhood. Why are some people consistently more aggressive than others? Each of the six approaches to personality provides at least one answer. As you read these answers, think about an aggressive person you have encountered or read about. Which of the six explanations seems to do the best job of explaining that person’s behavior?

The classic psychoanalytic explanation of aggression points to an unconscious death instinct. That is, we are all said to possess an unconscious desire to self-destruct. However, because people with a healthy personality do not hurt themselves, these self-destructive impulses may be turned outward and expressed against others in the form of aggression. Other psychoanalysts argue that aggression results when we are blocked from reaching our goals. A person who experiences a great deal of frustration, perhaps someone who is constantly falling short of a desired goal, is a likely candidate for persistent aggressive behavior. In most cases, the person is unaware of the real reasons for the aggression.

Personality theorists who follow the trait approach focus on individual differences and the stability of aggressive behavior (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006). For example, one team of researchers measured aggressiveness in 8-year-old children (Huesmann, Eron, & Yarmel, 1987). The investigators interviewed the participants again when the participants were 30 years old. The researchers discovered that the children identified as aggressive in elementary school were the most likely to have become aggressive adults. The children who pushed and shoved their classmates...
often grew into adults who abused their spouses and engaged in violent crim-
inal behavior.

Personality psychologists from the biological perspective also are inter-
ested in stable patterns of aggressive behavior. They point to a genetic predis-
position to act aggressively as one reason for this stability. Evidence now
suggests that some people inherit more of a proclivity toward aggression
than others (Miles & Carey, 1997). That is, some people may be born with
aggressive dispositions that, depending on their upbringing, result in their
becoming aggressive adults. Other psychologists explain aggression in terms
of evolutionary theory (Cairns, 1986). For example, the fact that men tend
to be more aggressive than women might be explained by the male’s inherited
need to exercise control over rivals so that he can survive and pass along his
genes. Other researchers look at the role hormones and neurotransmitters
play in aggressive behavior (Berman, McCloskey, Fanning, Schumacher, &
Coccaro, 2009; Klinesmith, Kasser, & McAndrew, 2006).

Psychologists with a humanistic approach to personality explain aggres-
sion in yet another way. These theorists deny that some individuals are born
to be aggressive. In fact, many argue that people are basically good. They
believe all people can become happy, nonviolent adults if allowed to grow
and develop in an enriching and encouraging environment. Problems develop
when something interferes with this natural growth process. Aggressive chil-
dren often come from homes in which basic needs are not met adequately. If
the child develops a poor self-image, he or she may strike out at others in
frustration.

The behavioral/social learning approach contrasts in many ways with
the humanistic view. According to these psychologists, people learn to be
aggressive the same way they learn other behaviors. Playground bullies find
that aggressive behavior is rewarded. They get to bat first and have first
choice of playground equipment because other children fear them. The key
to the behavioral interpretation is that rewarded behavior will be repeated.
Thus the bully probably will continue this aggressive behavior and try it in
other situations. If the aggression is continually met with rewards instead of
punishment, the result will be an aggressive adult. People also learn from
watching models. Children may learn from watching aggressive classmates
that hurting others is sometimes useful. As discussed in Chapter 14, many
people are concerned that the aggressive role models children routinely
watch on television may be responsible for increasing the amount of violence
in society.

Cognitive psychologists approach the question of aggressive behavior
from yet another perspective. Their main focus is on the way aggressive peo-
ple process information. Certain cues in the environment, such as images of
guns and fighting, often trigger a network of aggressive thoughts and emo-
tions. When aggressive thoughts are highly accessible, people are more likely
to interpret situations as threatening and respond to those perceived threats
with violence. Although most of us ignore unintended insults and accidental
bumps in the hallway, individuals with highly accessible aggressive thoughts
are likely to respond with threats of violence and angry shoves.
Now, let’s return to the original question: Why do some people show a consistent pattern of aggressive behavior? Each of the six approaches to personality offers a different explanation. Which is correct? One possibility is that only one is correct and that future research will identify that theory. A second possibility is that each approach is partially correct. There may be six (or more) different causes of aggressive behavior. Still a third possibility is that the six explanations do not contradict one another but rather differ only in their focus. That is, it’s possible that aggressiveness is relatively stable and reflects an aggressive trait (the trait approach). But it might also be the case that some people tend to interpret ambiguous events as threatening (the cognitive explanation) because of past experiences in which they were assaulted (the behavioral/social learning explanation). These people may have been born with a tendency to respond to threats in an aggressive manner (the biological approach). But perhaps if they had been raised in a nonfrustrating environment (the psychoanalytic approach) or in a supportive home in which their basic needs were met (the humanistic approach), they would have overcome their aggressive tendencies. The point is that each approach appears to contribute something to our understanding of aggression.

**Example 2: Depression**

Most of us know what it is like to be depressed. We have all had days when we feel a little blue or melancholy. Like many college students, you may also have suffered through longer periods of intense sadness and a general lack of motivation to do anything. Although most of us fluctuate through changing moods and levels of interest and energy, some people seem more prone to depression than others. Once again, each of the six approaches to personality has a different explanation for individual differences in depression.

According to Sigmund Freud, the founder of the psychoanalytic approach, depression is anger turned inward. That is, people suffering from depression hold unconscious feelings of anger and hostility. They may want to strike out at family members, but a healthy personality does not express such feelings overtly. Psychoanalysts also argue that each of us has internalized the standards and values of society, which typically discourage the expression of hostility. Therefore, these angry feelings are turned inward, and people take it out on themselves. As with most psychoanalytic explanations, this process takes place at an unconscious level.

Trait theorists are concerned with identifying depression-prone individuals. Researchers find that a person’s general emotional level today is a good indicator of that person’s emotions in the future. One team of investigators measured depression in a group of middle-aged men and again 30 years later (Leon, Gillum, Gillum, & Gouze, 1979). The researchers found an impressively high correlation between the men’s depression levels at the two different times. Yet another study found that depression levels in 18-year-olds could be predicted from looking at participants’ behavior from as early as 7 years of age (Block, Gjerde, & Block, 1991).
Biological personality psychologists point to evidence that some people may inherit a genetic susceptibility to depression (McGue & Christensen, 1997). A person born with this vulnerability faces a much greater likelihood than the average individual of reacting to stressful life events with depression. Because of this inherited tendency, these people often experience repeated bouts of depression throughout their lives.

Humanistic personality theorists explain depression in terms of self-esteem. That is, people who frequently suffer from depression are those who have failed to develop a good sense of their self-worth. A person’s level of self-esteem is established while growing up and, like other personality concepts, is fairly stable across time and situations. The ability to accept oneself, even one’s faults and weaknesses, is an important goal for humanistic therapists when dealing with clients suffering from depression.

The behavioral/social learning approach examines the type of learning history that leads to depression. Behaviorists argue that depression results from a lack of positive reinforcers in a person’s life. That is, you may feel down and unmotivated because you see few activities in your life worth doing. A more extensive behavioral model of depression, covered in Chapter 14, proposes that depression develops from experiences with aversive situations over which people have little control. This theory maintains that exposure to uncontrollable events creates a perception of helplessness.

What causes depression? Depending on which approach to personality you adopt, you might explain depression in terms of anger turned inward, a stable trait, an inherited predisposition, low self-esteem, a lack of reinforcers, or negative thoughts.
that is generalized to other situations and may develop into classic symptoms of depression.

Some cognitive personality psychologists have taken this explanation one step further. These psychologists argue that whether people become depressed depends on how they interpret their inability to control events. For example, people who attribute their inability to get a promotion to a temporary economic recession will not become as depressed as people who believe it is the result of personal inadequacies. Other cognitive psychologists propose that some individuals use something like a depressive filter to interpret and process information. That is, depressed people are prepared to see the world in the most depressing terms possible. For this reason, depressed people can easily recall depressing experiences. People and places they encounter are likely to remind them of some sad or unpleasant time. In short, people become depressed because they are prepared to generate depressing thoughts.

Which of these accounts of depression strikes you as the most accurate? If you have been depressed, was it because of your low self-esteem, because you experienced an uncontrollable situation, or because you tend to look at the world through a depressing lens? As in the aggression example, more than one of these approaches may be correct. You may have found that one theory could explain an experience you had with depression last year, whereas another seems to better account for a more recent bout. In addition, the theories can at times complement each other. For example, people might interpret events in a depressing way because of their low self-esteem.

One more lesson can be taken from these two examples: You need not align yourself with the same approach to personality when explaining different phenomena. For example, you may have found that the cognitive explanation for aggression made the most sense to you, but that the humanistic approach provided the best account of depression. This observation demonstrates the main point of this section: Each of the six approaches has something to offer the student interested in understanding personality.

**Personality and Culture**

Psychologists have increasingly recognized the important role culture plays in understanding personality. To some students, this observation at first seems inconsistent with the notion of personality as distinct from situational influences on behavior. However, psychologists now recognize that many of the assumptions people in Western developed countries make when describing and studying personality may not apply when dealing with people from different cultures (Benet-Martinez & Oishi, 2008; Cheung, van de Vijver, & Leong, 2011). It is not just that different experiences in different cultures affect how personalities develop. Rather, psychologists have come to see that people and their personalities exist within a cultural context.

Perhaps the most important distinction cross-cultural researchers make is between individualistic cultures and collectivist cultures (Triandis, 1989, 2001). **Individualistic cultures**, which include most Northern European countries and
the United States, place great emphasis on individual needs and accomplishments. People in these cultures like to think of themselves as independent and unique. In contrast, people in collectivist cultures are more concerned about belonging to a larger group, such as a family, tribe, or nation. These people are more interested in cooperation than competition. They obtain satisfaction when the group does well rather than from individual accomplishments. Many Asian, African, Central American, and South American countries fit the collectivist culture description. Consequently, concepts commonly studied by Western personality psychologists often take on very different meanings when people from collectivist cultures are studied. For example, research reviewed in Chapter 12 suggests that the Western notion of self-esteem is based on assumptions about personal goals and feelings of uniqueness that may not make sense to citizens of other countries (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2010).

Moreover, the kinds of behaviors examined in personality may have different meanings depending on the culture. For example, for many years personality psychologists have been concerned with achievement behavior. Traditionally, this means trying to predict who will get ahead in academic or business situations. However, this definition of achievement and success is not shared universally (Salili, 1994). In some collectivist cultures, success means cooperation and group accomplishments. Personal recognition may even be frowned upon by people living in these cultures. Similarly, we need to consider the culture a person comes from when identifying and treating psychological disorders (Benish, Quintana, & Wampold, 2011; Draguns, 2008; Pedersen, 2008). For example, behavior that suggests excessive dependency or an exaggerated sense of self in one culture might reflect good adjustment in another.

Thus it is worth remembering that most of the theories and much of the research covered in this book are based on observations in individualistic cultures. In fact, most of the research was conducted in the United States, the country that was found in one study to be the most individualistic of 41 nations examined (Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998). This does not mean the research should be dismissed. Rather, we should keep in mind that whether a particular description applies to people in all cultures remains an open question. In some cases, such as the research on dream content presented in Chapter 4 and the studies on marriage patterns presented in Chapter 10, investigators find nearly identical results across very different cultural groups. In other cases, such as in the self-esteem and achievement examples, they find important differences among cultures. Identifying the cultural limitations or universality of various phenomena provides additional insight into the nature of the concepts we study.
sections is divided into four parts (in two chapters). These divisions represent the four components necessary for a complete understanding of personality. Each section begins with a presentation of theory. Each of the personality theorists covered in these pages presents a comprehensive model for how human personality is structured and how it operates. But psychologists have never been content to simply describe personality. Rather, we have a long history of applying the information gained from theories and research to questions and issues that directly affect people’s lives. These applications include psychotherapy, education, and behavior in the workplace. An example of how psychologists apply their theories to these kinds of settings is presented for each approach. Psychologists working within each of the approaches also must develop ways to measure the personality constructs they study and use. Thus assessment is another important area of personality psychology covered within each approach. Examples of personality assessment are scattered throughout this book. If you take the time to try each of these inventories, not only will you obtain a better understanding of how psychologists from the different approaches measure personality, but you will also gain insight into your own personality. As you complete each inventory, you can record your scores in the Appendix of this book. In addition, within each section, an entire chapter is devoted to research relevant to that approach to personality. Personality psychology is, after all, a science. By examining a few research topics in depth for each of the approaches, you will see how theories generate research and how the findings from one study typically lead to new questions and more research.

**Theory**

Each approach to understanding personality begins with a theory. This theory usually comes from the writings of several important psychologists who provide their own descriptions of consistent patterns of behavior and interpersonal processes. They explain the mechanisms that underlie human personality and how these mechanisms are responsible for creating behaviors unique to a given individual. In most cases, the theorists also attempt to explain how differences in personality develop. And many describe methods for changing personality based on their theories.

If you were to develop your own theory of personality, like the theorists covered in this book, you would need to address several critical questions about the nature of human personality. Let’s look briefly at a few of the most important questions you would need to consider. The way theorists from each of the six approaches generally deal with these issues is diagrammed in Figure 1.1.

**Genetic Versus Environmental Influences**

Are people born with the seeds for their adult personalities already intact? Or do we enter this world with no inherited personality orientation, with each healthy baby just as likely as any other to become a great humanitarian, a criminal, a leader, or a helpless psychotic? In one way or another, each major theory of personality addresses this question: To what extent are our
personalities the result of inherited predispositions, and to what extent are they shaped by the environment in which we grow up? Many biological and trait theorists argue that too often psychologists fail to recognize the importance of inherited predispositions. To a lesser degree, psychoanalytic theorists also emphasize innate needs and behavior patterns, albeit unconscious. However, humanistic, behavioral/social learning, and cognitive theorists are less likely to emphasize inherited influences on personality. Many of these theorists don’t deny the role of genetics, but they place focus their attention on other determinants of personality. To some extent, the answer to these questions is an empirical one. And as we will see in Chapter 10, a growing amount of research implicates inherited factors in the development of personality.

**Conscious Versus Unconscious Determinants of Behavior**

To what extent are people aware of the causes of their behavior? Psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud argued that much of what we do is under the control of unconscious forces, which by definition are outside of our awareness. B. F. Skinner, an influential behavior theorist, argued that people assume they understand the reasons for their actions when in reality they do not. In contrast, trait and cognitive theorists rely heavily on self-report data in developing their theories and in their research. They assume people can identify and report, for example, their level of social anxiety or how they organize information in their memories. However, these psychologists hedge away from an extreme position on this issue. Increasingly, cognitive psychologists recognize that much information processing takes place at a level below awareness. Humanistic theorists often take a middle-ground position on this issue. Although these theorists argue that no one knows us better than ourselves,
they also acknowledge that many people do not understand why they act the way they do.

**Free Will Versus Determinism**

To what extent do we decide our own fate, and to what extent are our behaviors determined by forces outside our control? This is an old issue in psychology that has spilled over from even older discussions in philosophy and theology. On one extreme we find theorists from the behavioral/social learning approach called radical behaviorists. Perhaps most outspoken on this issue was B. F. Skinner, who argued that our behavior is not freely chosen but rather the result of environmental forces and our accumulated history of experiences. Skinner called freedom a myth. Psychoanalytic theorists typically take a less extreme position but still emphasize innate needs and unconscious mechanisms that leave much of human behavior outside of our control. At the other end of the spectrum are the humanistic theorists, who often identify personal choice and responsibility as the cornerstones of mental health. Humanistic psychotherapists frequently encourage clients to recognize the extent to which they are responsible for their own lives.

Although less clear on this issue, trait, biological, and cognitive theorists probably fall somewhere between these others. Trait theorists and biological theorists often emphasize genetic predispositions that tend to limit development in certain areas. But none of these psychologists would argue that personality is completely dictated by these predispositions. Similarly, cognitive psychotherapists often encourage their clients to recognize how they cause many of their own problems and help clients to develop strategies to avoid future difficulties.

**Application**

The most obvious way personality psychologists use their theories to address problems is through psychotherapy. Many of the personality theorists covered in the book were also therapists who developed and refined their ideas about human personality as they worked with clients. Psychotherapy comes in many different styles, each reflecting assumptions the therapist makes about the nature of personality. For example, psychoanalytic therapists attend to unconscious causes of the problem behavior. Humanistic therapists are more likely to work in a nondirective manner to provide the proper atmosphere in which clients can explore their own feelings. Cognitive therapists try to change the way their clients process information, whereas behaviorists might structure the environment so that desired behaviors increase in frequency and undesired behaviors decrease. Personality theory and research are also used by psychologists working in educational, organizational, and counseling settings. In the following chapters, you will also see what personality psychologists tell us about religion, effective teaching, and choosing a career.

**Assessment**

How psychologists measure personality depends on which of the six approaches they adhere to. Many personality researchers use self-report
inventories, in which test takers answer a series of questions about themselves. But psychoanalytic psychologists are more interested in what people are unable to describe directly. They learn about some of these unconscious thoughts by asking test takers to respond to ambiguous stimuli, which a trained psychologist then interprets. Traditional behavioral psychologists often take another tactic in assessing personality. They’re not interested in structures and concepts that supposedly exist within people’s minds. To determine consistent behavior patterns, these psychologists observe behavior. A behavioral psychologist who wants to measure cooperation might observe people working on a group task. A person who engages in a large number of cooperative behaviors (helping others in the group, complimenting others on their work) would be identified as a cooperative person. In short, how a psychologist measures personality depends on what he or she thinks personality is.

Research

Although the focus thus far has been on the differences among the six approaches, one feature they all have in common is that each generates a great deal of relevant research. As you will see, sometimes this research tests
principles and assumptions central to the theory. Other times researchers are interested in further exploring some of the concepts introduced by a personality theory. You will also notice that several topics—health, relationships, depression, achievement, anxiety, aggression—surface in more than one place in the book. This is because a full understanding of these topics requires that we examine them from more than one approach. Several psychology journals are devoted to publishing research on personality, and many more publish articles relevant to the topics examined here. Psychology researchers employ a large number of methods in their efforts to uncover information about personality (Craik, 1986; Mallon, Kingsley, Affleck, & Tennen, 1998; Tracy, Robins, & Sherman, 2009). You won’t need a complete understanding of these procedures to appreciate the research covered in this book. But it will help if you have a grasp of the hypothesis-testing approach and a few of the common procedures used by personality researchers. These topics are addressed in the next chapter.

Summary

1. Personality psychology is concerned with the differences among people. Although there is no agreed-upon definition, personality is defined here as consistent behavior patterns and intrapersonal processes originating within the individual.

2. For convenience, the many theories of personality are divided into six general categories: the psychoanalytic, trait, biological, humanistic, behavioral/social learning, and cognitive approaches. Each approach provides a different focus for explaining individual differences in behavior. The six approaches can be thought of as complementary models for understanding human personality, although occasionally they present competing accounts of behavior.

3. Personality psychologists need to consider the culture from which an individual comes. Most of the findings reported in this book are based on research in individualistic cultures, such as the United States. However, these results don’t always generalize to people in collectivist cultures.

4. A thorough understanding of human personality requires more than the study of theory. Consequently, we’ll also examine how each of the approaches is applied to practical concerns, how each deals with personality assessment, and some of the research relevant to the issues and topics addressed by the theories.
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Summary
Not long ago, “Desperate in Dallas” wrote to a newspaper advice columnist about her husband’s 16-year-old cousin, who was living with them. The boy didn’t want to work, didn’t want to go to school, and generally was a very messy houseguest. What was she to do? The columnist explained to “Desperate” that the boy’s real problem was the rejection he had received from his parents earlier in his life. These early childhood experiences were responsible for the boy’s lack of motivation. Within the next few weeks, the adviser also explained to “Wondering in Boston” that a 5-year-old boy became aggressive from watching too many violent programs on television. She told “Anonymous in Houston” that her 5-year-old daughter was going to be a leader, and “Intrigued in Norfolk” that, although some people are routinely incapacitated with minor aches and pains, others are capable of ignoring them.

In each of these examples, the columnist was explaining why a certain person engages in consistent behavior patterns—that is, the causes of that person’s personality. Millions of people seem to think this columnist has something to say about human behavior. But how does she know? Experience? Intelligence? A keen insight into human nature? Perhaps. In a way, advice columnists represent one avenue for understanding personality—through expert opinion. In some ways, the columnist is similar to the great personality theorists who study the works of others, make their own observations, and then describe what they believe are the causes of human behavior. As you will see in Chapter 3, Sigmund Freud proposed many groundbreaking ideas about personality. Freud read widely about what his contemporaries were saying about behavior. He worked and consulted with some of the great thinkers of the day who also were concerned about psychological phenomena. And Freud carefully observed his patients, who came to him with a variety of psychological problems. From the information gathered from all of these sources, Freud developed a theory of personality that he spent the rest of his career promoting.

Although more scholarly than a columnist’s one-paragraph diagnosis, Freud’s writings often evoke a similar response: How does he know? Freud’s ideas are intriguing, and his arguments at times persuasive, but most personality psychologists want more than an expert’s viewpoint before they accept a personality theory. They want empirical research. They want studies examining key predictions from the theory. They want some hard numbers to support those predictions. This is not because an expert’s views are of no value. Quite the contrary, the views and observations of personality theorists form the backbone of this book. But theories alone provide only part of the picture. Understanding the nature of human personality also requires an examination of what psychologists have learned from rigorous empirical investigations.

This chapter presents a brief introduction to personality research, beginning with a description of some basic concepts associated with the hypothesis-testing approach to research, with an emphasis on issues particularly relevant for personality researchers. Next we look at a research procedure that has played a significant role in the history of personality psychology—the case
study method. We then briefly touch on what you will need to know about statistical analysis of data. Finally, because personality psychologists often rely on personality assessment, we quickly review some of the concepts associated with measuring individual differences in personality.

The Hypothesis-Testing Approach

Each of us on occasion speculates about the nature of personality. You may have wondered why you seem to be more self-conscious than others, why a family member is depressed so often, or why you have so much trouble making friends. In the latter case, you may have watched the way a popular student interacts with the people she meets and compared her behavior with the way you act around strangers. You may have even tried to change your behavior to be more like hers and then watched to see if this affected how people react to you.

In essence, the difference between this process and that used by personality psychologists lies only in the degree of sophistication. Like all of us, these researchers speculate about the nature of personality. From observations, knowledge about previous theory and research, and careful speculation, they generate hypotheses about why certain people behave the way they do. Then, using experimental methods, they collect data to see if their explanations about human behavior are correct. Like pieces in a large jigsaw puzzle, each study makes another contribution to our understanding of personality. However, by the time you get to the end of this book, it should be clear that this is one puzzle that will never be finished.

Theories and Hypotheses

Most personality research begins with a theory—a general statement about the relationship between constructs or events. Theories differ in the range of events or phenomena they explain. Some, such as the major personality theories discussed in this book, are very broad. Psychologists have used Freud’s psychoanalytic theory to explain topics as diverse as what causes psychological disorders, why people turn to religion, and why certain jokes are funny. However, personality researchers typically work with theories considerably narrower in application. For example, they might speculate about the reasons some people are more motivated to achieve than others or about the relationship between a parent’s behavior and a child’s level of self-esteem. It might be useful to think of the larger theories, such as Freud’s, as collections of more specific theories that share certain assumptions about the nature of human personality.

A good theory possesses at least two characteristics. First, a good theory is parsimonious. Scientists generally operate under the “law of parsimony”—that is, the simplest theory that can explain the phenomenon is the best. As you will see throughout this book, several theories can be generated to explain any one behavior. Some can be quite extensive, including many
concepts and assumptions, whereas others explain the phenomenon in relatively simple terms. Which theory is better? Although it sometimes seems that scientists enjoy wrapping their work in fancy terms and esoteric concepts, the truth is that if two theories can account for an effect equally well, the simpler explanation is preferred.

Second, a good theory is *useful.* More specifically, unless a theory can generate testable hypotheses, it will be of little or no use to scientists. Ideas that cannot be tested are not necessarily incorrect. It's just that they do not lend themselves to scientific investigation. For example, throughout history some people have explained psychological disorders in terms of invisible demons taking over a person’s body. This may or may not be a correct statement about the causes of disorders. But unless this explanation is somehow testable, the theory cannot be examined through scientific methods and therefore holds little value for scientists.

However, theories themselves are never tested. Instead, investigators derive from the theory hypotheses that can then be tested in research. A *hypothesis* is a formal prediction about the relationship between two or more variables that is logically derived from the theory. For example, many psychologists are interested in individual differences in loneliness (Chapter 12). That is, they want to know why some people frequently suffer from feelings of loneliness, whereas others rarely feel lonely. One theory proposes that lonely people lack the social skills necessary to develop and maintain satisfying relationships. Because this is a useful theory, many predictions can be logically derived from it, as shown in Figure 2.1. For example, if the theory correctly describes a cause of loneliness, we might expect consistently lonely people to make fewer attempts to initiate conversations than those who are not lonely. Another prediction might be that these lonely people have a poor idea of how they are being perceived by others. Yet another prediction might maintain that lonely people make more socially inappropriate statements than nonlonely people during conversations.

Each of these predictions can be tested. For example, we might test the last prediction by recording conversations lonely and nonlonely people have with new acquaintances. Judges could evaluate the conversations in terms of number of appropriate responses, number of appropriate questions, and so on. If people who identify themselves as lonely make fewer appropriate responses during the conversation, the prediction is confirmed. We then say we have support for the theory. But notice that the theory itself is not tested directly. In fact, theories are never proved or disproved. Rather, a theory is more or less supported by the research and therefore is more or less useful to scientists trying to understand the phenomenon. The more often research confirms a prediction derived from a theory, the more faith psychologists have that the theory accurately describes the nature of things. However, if empirical investigations consistently fail to confirm predictions, we are much less likely to accept the theory. In these cases, scientists typically generate a new theory or modify the old one to better account for the research findings.
Experimental Variables

Good research progresses from theory to prediction to experiment. The basic elements of an experiment are the experimental variables, which are divided into two types: independent variables and dependent variables. An independent variable determines how the groups in the experiment are divided. Often this is manipulated by the experimenter, such as when participants are randomly assigned to different experimental conditions. An independent variable might be the amount of a drug each group receives, how much anxiety is created in each group, or the type of story each group reads. For example, if level of anxiety is the independent variable, a researcher might tell Group A that they will give a speech in front of a dozen critical people, Group B that they will give a speech in front of a few supportive people, and Group C nothing about a speech. Because each of the groups created by the independent variable receives a slightly different treatment, some researchers refer to the independent variable as the treatment variable.
A dependent variable is measured by the investigator and used to compare the experimental groups. In a well-designed study, differences among groups on the dependent variable can be attributed to the different levels of the independent variable. Returning to the anxiety example, suppose the researcher’s hypothesis was that people reduce anxiety about upcoming events by obtaining as much information about the situation as possible. The researcher might use level of anxiety as the independent variable, creating high-, moderate-, and low-anxiety conditions. The three groups might be compared on how many questions they ask the experimenter about the upcoming event. In this case, the number of questions is the dependent variable. The results of such an experiment might look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Anxiety</th>
<th>Moderate Anxiety</th>
<th>Low Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the experiment has been designed correctly, the investigator will attribute the difference in the dependent variable (the number of questions) to the different levels of the independent variable (anxiety). Because experimenters want to say that differences in the dependent variable are the result of the...
different treatment each of the groups received, some researchers refer to the dependent variable as the *outcome* variable.

However, most personality research is more elaborate than this example indicates. Researchers typically use more than one independent variable. In the information-seeking example, an experimenter might want to further divide participants into groups according to how shy they typically are. The researcher might predict that anxiety leads to a search for information, but only among people who are not shy. Researchers in this hypothetical study might use two independent variables to divide participants into groups. They might randomly assign participants to either an anxiety (anticipates speech) or a no-anxiety group, and within each of these groups identify those who are shy and those who are not. If the dependent variable remains the number of questions asked of the experimenter, the results might turn out like those shown in Figure 2.2. This figure illustrates what is called an *interaction*. That is, how one independent variable affects the dependent variable depends on the other independent variable. In this example, whether anxiety leads to an increase in questions depends on whether the participant is high or low in shyness.

**Manipulated Versus Nonmanipulated Independent Variables**

Sometimes personality researchers randomly assign participants to conditions, such as putting them into anxiety or no-anxiety groups. However, other times...
they simply identify which group the participant already belongs to, such as whether the person is shy or not shy. The significance of this difference is illustrated in the following example.

Suppose you are interested in the effect violent television programs have on the amount of aggression people display in real life. You recruit two kinds of participants—those who watch a lot of violent TV shows and those who watch relatively few. You then measure the participants’ level of aggression in a number of situations. Consistent with the hypothesis, you find that people who watch a lot of violent television are more aggressive than those who watch relatively little violent TV. You might be tempted to conclude that watching violent television programs causes people to be more aggressive. However, based on this study alone, your conclusion must be tempered. For example, it’s possible that some people watch violent TV shows precisely because they are aggressive. Perhaps they are more entertained by programs that include shootings, stabbings, and other violent acts. Thus, although the findings are consistent with the hypothesis, statements about cause and effect must be qualified.

This example illustrates the fundamental difference between research using manipulated independent variables and research using nonmanipulated independent variables. An investigator who uses a manipulated independent variable begins with a large number of participants and randomly assigns them to experimental groups. That is, each person has an equally likely chance of being assigned to Condition A as to Condition B (or C, or D, and so on). Investigators know all participants are not exactly alike at the beginning of the study. Some are naturally more aggressive than others, some more anxious, some more intelligent. Each has different life experiences that might affect what he or she does in the study. However, by using a large number of participants and randomly assigning them to conditions, researchers assume that all these differences will be evened out. Thus, although within any given condition there are people who are typically high or low in aggressiveness, each condition should have the same average level of aggressiveness at the beginning of the experiment.

The researcher then introduces the independent variable. For example, one group might be shown 30 minutes of violent television programming, another group might watch a baseball game, and still another group might sit quietly and watch no television. Because we assume participants in each condition are nearly identical on average at the start of the study, any differences among the groups after watching the program can be attributed to the independent variable. That is, if participants who watched the violent TV shows are more aggressive than those who watched the nonviolent shows or those who watched no TV, we can conclude with reasonable confidence that watching the violent TV shows caused the participants to act more aggressively.

This procedure contrasts with one that uses nonmanipulated variables. A nonmanipulated independent variable (sometimes referred to as a subject variable) exists without the researcher’s intervention. For example, researchers might divide people into high self-esteem and low self-esteem groups, or into

“Personality is so complex a thing that every legitimate method must be employed in its study.”

Gordon Allport
first-born, middle-born, or last-born categories. In these cases, the investigator does not randomly assign participants to a condition. Returning to the earlier example, the researcher who compared frequent and infrequent television viewers did not manipulate participants into those two categories. Instead, the participants had already determined which of the groups they belonged to without any action on the researcher’s part.

The difficulty with this and other nonmanipulated independent variables is that the researcher cannot assume the people in the two groups are nearly identical on average at the beginning of the experiment. For example, people who watch fewer hours of television might be more intelligent or come from a higher socioeconomic level. We can be fairly certain that they have more time for activities other than television, such as reading or interacting with friends. The two kinds of participants also might differ in terms of self-esteem, diet, and, most notably, their level of aggression prior to participating in the experiment. Thus any differences we find between the two groups could be caused by any of these differences and not necessarily by the number of violent TV shows each group watches.

Because it is difficult to determine cause-and-effect relationships with nonmanipulated independent variables, researchers generally prefer to manipulate variables. However, doing so is not always possible. Sometimes manipulating the variable is too expensive, too difficult, or unethical. This is a particular problem in personality research because many of the variables researchers want to study simply cannot be manipulated. Returning to the violent television example, it would be next to impossible to tell some participants, “You watch a lot of violent television during the next few years,” and tell others, “You watch no violent television until I tell you it’s okay.” Instead, if we want to know about the long-term effects of exposure to violent TV, we have to accept the participants as they are, understanding that many group differences exist at the outset of the study. Sometimes investigators try to control some of these known differences, such as by comparing the education levels of the two groups. However, researchers can never be sure that they have controlled all relevant variables.

This is not to say that research with nonmanipulated independent variables is useless. On the contrary, personality psychologists often find that relying on nonmanipulated variables is the only way to examine a topic of interest. How else can we study differences between introverts and extraverts or differences between men and women? A recent survey of academic journals found that the vast majority of personality research relies on nonmanipulated independent variables (Revelle & Oehlberg, 2008). Nonetheless, investigators who conduct this research must remain cautious when making statements about cause and effect.

**Prediction Versus Hindsight**

Which person is more impressive: the one who can explain after a basketball game why the winning team was victorious, or the one who accurately tells you before the game which team will win and why? Most of us are more impressed with the second person. After all, anyone can come up with an
explanation after the facts are in. But people who really understand the game can make reasonable guesses about what will happen when two teams meet.

In a similar manner, if a scientist has a legitimate theory, we can expect him or her to make reasonably accurate predictions about what will happen in a study before the data are in. Remember, the purpose of research is to provide support for a hypothesis. Researchers generate a theory, make a hypothesis, and collect data that either support or do not support the hypothesis. Suppose a researcher examines the relationship between self-esteem and helping behavior, but the investigator has no clear prediction beforehand of what this relationship might be. If the study finds that high self-esteem people help more than low self-esteem people, the researcher might conclude that this is because people who feel good about themselves maintain that positive evaluation by doing good things. The explanation sounds reasonable, but do the data support the hypothesis? From a scientific standpoint, the answer is “No” because the hypothesis was generated after the results were seen. With that sequence, there is no way the hypothesis would not be supported. If the study found that low self-esteem people help more, the same researcher might conclude that this is because these people are trying to improve their self-image by doing good things. With no possibility that the hypothesis might not be supported, the hypothesis has not really been tested. This is not to say researchers should ignore findings they haven’t predicted. On the contrary, such findings are often the basis for future hypotheses and further research. But explaining everything after the results are in explains nothing.

**Replication**

When investigators conduct a well-designed study and uncover statistically significant results, they usually report the findings in a journal or perhaps at a professional conference. Sometimes the findings are cited in popular media as something researchers know about the topic. However, most psychologists are cautious about relying on one research finding when drawing conclusions about human behavior.

There are many reasons a researcher might find a statistically significant effect in a given study. There could be something peculiar about the people in the sample. There might be something special about the time the research was conducted—perhaps an unusual mood in the country or on campus, caused by an important event. Or the finding could be the result of some unknown and inadvertent aspect of the particular experimental procedure. Whatever the reason, it is dangerous to assume that a significant finding from one study provides reliable evidence for an effect.

The way to deal with this problem is through *replication*. The more often an effect is found in research, the more confidence we have that it reflects a genuine relationship. Replications often examine participant populations different from those used in the original research. This helps to determine whether the effect applies to a larger number of people or is limited to the kind of individuals used in the original sample. Yet determining the strength of an effect by how often it is replicated is not always easy. One difficulty has been called the “File Drawer” problem (Rosenthal, 1979). That is, investigators tend to
publish and report research only when they find significant effects. When an attempt at replication fails, the researcher may decide something has gone wrong—perhaps the wrong materials were used, perhaps something was not done the way the original researcher did it, and so on. And so the research is stored away in a file drawer and never reported. The result is that a well-known research finding may, in fact, be difficult to replicate. But because the failures at replication are stored away in file drawers, we might not realize the problem exists.

The Case Study Method

Like a carpenter or a physician, personality researchers must use many different tools to be effective in their job. Although most personality psychologists rely on empirical studies with large numbers of participants to test their ideas, there are other ways to examine individual differences and personality processes. One procedure occasionally used by personality researchers is the **case study method**, an in-depth evaluation of a single individual (or sometimes a few individuals). Typically, the participant in a case study is a psychotherapy client suffering from a problem of interest to the investigator. The researcher records in great detail the person’s history, current behavior, and changes in behavior over the course of the investigation, which sometimes lasts for years. Case study data are usually descriptive. That is, rather than reporting a lot of numbers and statistical analyses, investigators describe their impressions of what the person did and what the behavior means. Researchers occasionally include quantitative assessments, such as recording how many times the person washes his or her hands in a 24-hour period. However, data comparing the individual with another group or another person are rarely reported.

As you will see throughout this book, case studies have played an important role in the history of personality psychology. Sigmund Freud relied almost exclusively on his own in-depth analysis of patients when formulating ideas about personality. In fact, many of Freud’s initial insights into the functions of the human mind came from his observations of one early patient, Anna O., whose story is told in Chapter 3. Gordon Allport, the first psychologist to promote the concept of traits, argued that we cannot capture the essence of a whole personality without an in-depth analysis of a single individual. Humanistic theorists, most notably Carl Rogers, developed their unique concept of human nature through the extensive evaluation of psychotherapy clients. Behaviorists also sometimes rely on case studies to illustrate various aspects of their theories and the effectiveness of their therapies. For example, we will review John B. Watson’s work with an infant named “Little Albert” in Chapter 13. This famous case study has been widely cited as evidence for the behaviorist explanation of abnormal behaviors.

Limitations of the Case Study Method

The widespread use of the case study method by prominent psychologists may surprise you at first given some of the obvious weaknesses of this
method. First is the problem of generalizing from a single individual to other people. Just because one person reacts to events in a certain way does not mean all people do. In fact, many case study participants come to the attention of personality theorists when they seek out psychotherapy, often because they feel different from others. Most experimenters use a large number of participants in their studies as a way to eliminate the bias that comes from examining just a few people who may or may not represent a larger population.

Second is the problem of determining cause-and-effect relationships with the case study method. For example, a client with a fear of water may recall a traumatic experience of nearly drowning as a child. Although we can speculate that this earlier event is responsible for the fear, we cannot be certain that the fear wouldn’t have developed without the experience. For this reason, researchers using case studies must be cautious when speculating about the causes of the behaviors they see.

Third, investigators’ subjective judgments can often interfere with scientific objectivity in case study work. The expectancies researchers bring to a case study may cause them to see that which confirms their hypotheses and to overlook that which does not. It’s possible that a different psychologist working with the same individual might come to different conclusions. As you will see in Chapter 3, Freud in particular has been criticized for approaching his cases with his own biases.

**Strengths of the Case Study Method**

With all these weaknesses, why do personality researchers ever rely on the case study method? One reason is that other research methods might not do the job. For example, Freud’s concern with the deeper understanding of an individual’s unconscious mind is not easily examined in other ways. The richness of a single person’s life can be lost when he or she is reduced to a few numbers that are then added to other participants’ numbers. This was one reason a team of researchers conducted a case study on Dodge Morgan, who at age 54 sailed around the globe by himself (Nasby & Read, 1997). The detailed analysis of Morgan’s behavior and personality as he made his way through this adventure provides insights unavailable through other methods. The case study method is also valuable for generating hypotheses about the nature of human personality. Researchers sometimes follow up case studies with more traditional scientific investigations.

The case study method is a particularly useful research tool in at least four situations. It is the most appropriate method when examining a rare case. Suppose you wanted to investigate the personalities of political assassins. You probably would be limited to exploring the background and behavior of only a handful of people who fall into this category. Similarly, therapists working with patients described as having multiple personalities often report their observations in a case study manner when recording information about what is probably a once-in-a-lifetime encounter.

The case study method is also appropriate when researchers can argue that the individual being studied is essentially no different from all normal
people on the dimension of interest. For example, case studies of “split-brain”
patients have uncovered important information about the functioning of the
human brain. Participants in these studies have had the corpus callosum
(which connects the right and left halves of the cerebral hemisphere) severed
as part of treatment for severe epilepsy. Because the physical functions of the
brain are basically alike for all normally functioning people, studying the
behavior of these few patients tells us much about the way our right and left
brains would operate if not connected by the corpus callosum.

Still another appropriate use of the case study is to illustrate a treatment.
Therapists often describe in detail the procedures they used to treat a particular client and the apparent success or failure of the therapy. A prudent therapist will not argue that all people suffering from the disorder should be treated in this way but rather will use the case study to suggest treatment programs other therapists might explore with their clients. A therapy procedure is most effectively demonstrated when the client’s progress is compared at various stages of the treatment, such as comparing a no-treatment period with a treatment stage.

Finally, an investigator might choose the case study method simply to demonstrate possibilities. For example, a researcher using one or two easily hypnotizable people might demonstrate impressive changes in behavior. Some deeply hypnotizable people have been reported to change skin temperature on one part of the body but not on another or to form blisters on their hands when imagining their hands are on fire. These studies are not intended to argue that all people are able to do these things but rather to illustrate some of the possibilities obtainable with hypnosis.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Suppose a waitress wants to know, for obvious reasons, what kind of behavior elicits the largest tips from customers. Her hypothesis is that smiling and acting in a friendly manner will result in better tips than acting in a more professional and reserved manner. She tests her hypothesis by alternating between the friendly and professional styles each night for 14 nights. At the end of each evening, she counts her tips and records the data. Suppose these are her findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly Approach</th>
<th>Professional Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$51.50</td>
<td>$56.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>51.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>52.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>59.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>50.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$55.23 average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.63 average</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The waitress concludes that the friendly approach indeed works best, and she changes to a friendly waitressing style from then on. But is her conclusion justified? We can see from the numbers that the friendly style came up with a higher average tip than the professional style. But by now you probably have already wondered if an average of $55.23 is reliably different from an average of $54.63. Because of naturally occurring variation in the amount of tips made in an evening, we would not expect the averages to come out exactly the same, even if the waitress never changed her style. One condition in this study would almost always come out at least a little higher than the other. So the question becomes: How much higher must one of the averages be before we conclude that the difference is not just a chance fluctuation but in fact represents a real difference between the two styles of waitressing? This is the question of statistical significance.

**Statistical Significance**

How can researchers tell if different group averages represent real effects or just chance fluctuations? Fortunately, statisticians have developed formulas that allow us to estimate the likelihood that the difference between the averages could have occurred by chance alone. There are many types of statistical tests, each appropriate for different types of data and different research designs. Some of the more common tests are an analysis of variance, a chi-square test, and a correlation coefficient.

Returning to the waitress example, if the two averages differed by an amount so small that it could have been caused by a chance fluctuation, we say the difference has not reached statistical significance. Conversely, if the difference is so large that in all likelihood it was not caused by chance but reflects a true difference between the two waitressing styles, we say the difference is statistically significant. In the latter case, the conclusion would be that one style of waitressing does seem to result in better tips than the other style.

However, statistical tests do not really provide a yes or no answer to our question. All they tell us is the statistical likelihood that the difference between the groups was caused by chance. But this observation raises another question. Suppose you apply a statistical test to the waitress’ data and find that a difference this large would occur by chance only one out of every three times you conducted the study. What would you conclude? That the different averages represent a real effect? It would be difficult to have much confidence in such a statement. The difference might be real, but there is a high probability that the finding is just a fluke. So when can we say we have a real difference? Traditionally, psychologists use a significance level of .05 to answer this question. This means that if the difference between the scores is so large that it would occur less than 5% of the time by chance, the difference is probably genuine.

But keep in mind that statistically significant findings are not necessarily “significant” in all ways. When researchers use a large number of participants, even small differences can be statistically significant. Whether the difference is large enough to be important is another question. In response to this concern, investigators often examine and report the size of the difference through statistical values known as effect size indicators.
Correlation Coefficients

The correlation coefficient is a favorite statistic among personality researchers, and one that will pop up from time to time in this book. The correlation coefficient is the appropriate statistical test when we want to understand the relationship between two measures. For example, we might be interested in the relationship between loneliness and depression. We could ask a large number of people to complete a loneliness scale as well as a depression inventory. If loneliness and depression are related, we would expect people who score high on loneliness to also score high on depression. Similarly, those who score low on loneliness should score low on depression.

Figure 2.3 presents three possible outcomes for this study. Each point on the figure represents one participant’s scores on both scales. The first outcome indicates that a person’s score on one scale is a fairly good predictor of that person’s score on the other scale. In this case, if we know someone is high on loneliness, we know that person is probably going to score high on depression as well. The second outcome indicates little or no relationship between the measures. Knowing a person’s score on one scale tells us nothing about what the other score will be. The third outcome, like the first, indicates that knowing a person’s loneliness score will help predict the depression score, but not in the way we might have anticipated. Here, a high score on one measure predicts a low score on the other.

After conducting the appropriate statistical test, we can reduce the data from our study to a single number, the correlation coefficient. This number can range from 1.00 to −1.00. Returning to the figure, the first outcome indicates a fairly strong relationship between loneliness and depression. The correlation coefficient for this figure might be .60. Because a high score on one measure indicates a high score on the other measure, this is a positive correlation. For the second outcome, the correlation coefficient is close to .00, indicating no relationship between the measures. The third outcome might yield a correlation of .60, also a fairly strong relationship between the variables.
This last outcome is referred to as a negative correlation, but this does not mean it is less important than a positive correlation of the same magnitude. For example, if we had compared scores on a loneliness scale with scores on a sociability measure, we probably would have anticipated that a high score on one test would predict a low score on the other.
Sometimes our culture seems obsessed with measuring personality. Popular magazines often promote short tests, or “quizzes,” to measure how good a roommate you are, what type of romantic partner you need, or the vacation spot that matches your personality. Although the magazines rarely claim their tests are based on scientific investigations, the popularity of these tests suggests that readers find them at least interesting, if not believable. There is something about calculating a score that gives credibility to an untested 10-item quiz.

Personality psychologists should also be concerned with the credibility of the numbers generated by their tests. Personality assessment is a central part of personality research. If we are going to study achievement motivation, self-esteem, social anxiety, and so on, we need to measure these concepts as accurately as possible. Similarly, psychologists working in education, human resources, and counseling often rely on personality tests to determine whether a child should be placed in a special class, whether an employee should be promoted to a new position, or whether a client needs to be admitted to a psychiatric hospital.

In each case, it is the responsibility of the people using the test to see that it accurately measures the concept they are interested in. Unfortunately, not all personality tests are as good as psychologists would prefer, and even the best tests can be used inappropriately. So how can we tell a good test from a bad one or determine whether the test measures what we want to measure? Before using any standardized test, we need to examine its reliability and validity.

**Reliability**

Suppose you took a personality test today and it indicated that, compared to others your age, you scored high on independence. That is, more than most people, you enjoy being on your own and making your own decisions. However, suppose next week you take the test again, and this time your score indicates you are relatively low on independence. Which of these scores reflects your true personality? Unfortunately, you have no way to know from this test whether you are an independent or a dependent person. The test suffers from poor reliability.

A test has good reliability when it measures consistently. One indication of a test’s reliability is how consistently the test measures over time. Many factors can contribute to poor consistency from one time to the next. The test questions or the scoring procedures might be vague, or perhaps test responses fluctuate wildly depending on the test taker’s mood. Nonetheless, because we assume personality is relatively consistent over time, tests designed to measure personality must provide consistent scores from one testing session to another.

A common way to determine a test’s consistency is to calculate a test–retest reliability coefficient. Researchers first administer the test to a large number of people. Some time later, usually after a few weeks, the same
people take the test again. The scores from the first administration are correlated with those from the second. Recall that correlation coefficients can range from 1.00 to $-1.00$. A high positive correlation coefficient indicates good consistency over time.

Unfortunately, whether a test is reliable is not a simple yes-or-no question. On one hand, a test–retest coefficient of .90 is probably reliable enough to meet most people’s needs. On the other hand, a reliability coefficient of .20 is no doubt too low for most purposes. But what about something in between? Is a test with a reliability coefficient of .50 or .60 acceptable? The answer depends on the researcher’s needs and the availability of alternative, more reliable tests. Sometimes the nature of the concept being measured contributes to low reliability. For example, tests given to young children, who often fluctuate in mood and attention, frequently have lower than desirable levels of reliability.

Another aspect of reliability is \textit{internal consistency}. A test is internally consistent when all the items on the test measure the same thing. Let’s say 10 items on a 20-item test of extraversion accurately measure the extent to which a test taker is an extraverted person. Because half the items measure extraversion, the overall score probably is somewhat indicative of the person’s true level on this trait. But because half the items measure something besides extraversion, the usefulness of the score is limited. This test suffers from poor internal consistency.

Once again, statistical tests are available to help us determine how well responses on one test item correlate with responses on the other items. A statistic called an \textit{internal consistency coefficient} can be calculated. A high coefficient indicates that most of the items are measuring the same concept; a low coefficient suggests items are measuring more than one concept. A careful test maker includes in the final version of a test only those items that “hang together” to measure the same concept.

\section*{Validity}

Reliability data tell us whether a test is measuring something consistently. But they tell us nothing about \textit{what} the test is measuring. That is why psychologists also examine data concerning the test’s validity. \textbf{Validity} refers to the extent to which a test measures what it is designed to measure. As with reliability, the question is not whether a test does or does not have validity. Rather, the question is how well the validity of the test has been demonstrated.

Validity is relatively easy to determine for some kinds of tests. For example, if the purpose of a test is to predict how well students will do on an upcoming task, researchers can simply compare the test scores with the task scores to determine the \textit{predictive validity} of the test. Unfortunately, demonstrating validity for most personality tests is not so easy. Personality psychologists often are interested in measuring hypothetical constructs, such as intelligence, masculinity, or social anxiety. \textit{Hypothetical constructs} are useful inventions researchers employ to describe concepts that have no physical reality. That is, no one can be shown an \textit{intelligence}. We can see behavior that
suggests high intellectual functioning, but intelligence remains a theoretical entity.

The problem for personality researchers, then, is how to demonstrate that a test measures something that, in reality, is but a useful abstract invention. How do we know if a test measures self-esteem? Test takers who agree with the item, “I am not as competent in sports as most people,” might have low self-esteem. Then again, they might just have poor athletic ability, or they might be depressed. Fortunately, there is much personality researchers can do to demonstrate the construct validity of their tests. Researchers can look at a test’s face validity, congruent validity, discriminant validity, and behavioral validation.

**Face Validity**

Perhaps the most obvious way to decide whether a test measures what it says it measures is to look at the test items. Most of us would accept that a test asking people “Do you feel nervous interacting with others?” or “Are you uncomfortable meeting new people?” is probably measuring something like social anxiety.

The test would have good face validity. That is, on the face of it, the test appears to be measuring social anxiety. Although most tests have good face validity, not all do. Some hypothetical constructs don’t lend themselves to obvious questions. For example, how would you design a test to measure creativity? Asking people “Are you creative?” probably won’t help much. Instead, you might ask people to write an ending to a story or to name as many uses as they can think of for an ordinary object. These tests might be good measures of creativity, but the face validity would be less certain than with more straightforward measures.

**Congruent Validity**

Imagine that you developed a new intelligence test that takes less time to administer than most commonly used tests. You’d probably want to see how scores from your test compare with scores on an established intelligence test. But suppose you gave both tests to a group of people and found a correlation of only .20 between the two test scores. In this case, a person could attain a high score on one intelligence test and a low score on the other, leaving you to wonder which is the true measure of intelligence. This is not to say that the old scale is measuring intelligence and your scale is not, but the low correlation would mean that the two tests are not measuring the same construct.

The congruent validity of a test, sometimes called convergent validity, is the extent to which scores from the test correlate with other measures of the same construct. If two tests measure the same thing, scores from the two tests should be highly correlated. However, congruent validity data are not limited to personality tests. For example, to determine the construct validity of an anxiety scale, you might compare test scores with anxiety ratings provided by a team of professional psychologists.
Discriminant Validity
In contrast to congruent validity, discriminant validity refers to the extent to which a test score does not correlate with the scores of theoretically unrelated measures. Let’s return to the problem of designing a creativity test. It is important to show that the test measures creativity instead of something that only resembles creativity, such as intelligence. To establish discriminant validity, you might give both the creativity test and an intelligence test to a group of people. If the two test scores are highly correlated, someone could argue that your creativity test does not measure creativity at all, but simply intelligence. However, if the correlation between the two tests is low, you have evidence that the two tests measure different constructs.

Behavioral Validation
Suppose you used scores on an assertiveness scale to predict how people respond when they receive poor service at a restaurant. Naturally, you would expect highly assertive individuals to complain about the service and people low in assertiveness to tolerate the inconvenience. But what if the test scores were completely unrelated to the behavior? What if people with low scores on the scale acted just as assertively as those with high scores? In this case, the validity of the test would be in doubt.

Another step in determining the construct validity of a test is behavioral validation. In other words, it is important that test scores predict relevant behavior. It is possible that test takers respond to assertiveness scales by indicating how they think they would act or how they wish they would act. It is possible for a test to have face validity, congruent validity, and discriminant validity, and still have questionable construct validity. If test scores cannot predict behavior, the usefulness of the test must be questioned. On the other hand, if the test does a good job of predicting how people will act in relevant situations, we have strong evidence for the test’s validity.

Summary
1. Personality psychologists examine personality processes through scientific research. Most of this research is based on the hypothesis-testing approach in which hypotheses are derived logically from theories. These hypotheses are then tested in studies, and the theory either is or is not supported. A good theory is parsimonious and capable of generating many testable hypotheses.

2. The basic elements of a research design are the independent and dependent variables. One important distinction in personality research concerns whether independent variables are manipulated by the researcher. When researchers examine nonmanipulated variables, they have less confidence when making statements about cause and effect. Predicted results are better than those explained in hindsight because the latter approach does not allow for hypothesis testing. Researchers need to replicate their findings,
but obtaining reliable information about how often an effect is replicated is a problem.

3. Many personality researchers use the case study method. Although case studies have some limitations, such as questionable generalizability to other populations, they also possess some unique advantages over other methods.

4. Researchers use statistical tests to determine whether the differences they find between groups are the result of chance fluctuations or whether they represent genuine effects. Personality researchers often use correlation coefficients when analyzing their data. A correlation coefficient identifies the direction and size of a relationship between two measures.

5. Personality researchers often use personality tests in their work. To determine the usefulness of a test, researchers look at evidence for the test’s reliability and validity. Reliability can be gauged through test–retest correlations and internal consistency coefficients. Validity is determined through face validity, congruent validity, discriminant validity, and behavioral validation. Researchers must make subjective judgments when deciding whether tests are reliable and valid enough for their needs.
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Summary
Although people have speculated about the nature of personality throughout history, the first acknowledged personality theorist did not emerge until the late 1800s. Then an Austrian neurologist began proposing such outrageous notions as the existence of sexual desires in young children, unconscious causes for baffling physical disorders, and treatment through a time-consuming, expensive procedure in which patients lie on a couch while the doctor listens to them talk about seemingly irrelevant topics. That neurologist, Sigmund Freud, continued to develop, promote, and defend his ideas despite intense criticism. By the time of his death in 1939, Freud had written numerous volumes, had established himself as the leader of an important intellectual movement, and had changed the thinking of psychologists, writers, parents, and laypeople for years to come.

Freud’s influence on 21st-century thought is so widespread that most of us fail to appreciate the extent to which his theory has become part of our thinking. For example, if you are like most adults in this culture, you freely accept the idea that what you do is sometimes influenced by an unconscious part of your mind. Most of us have said something like “I must have done that unconsciously” or pondered what sort of hidden psychological conflict might be behind a friend or loved one’s unusual behavior. Although Freud was not the first to talk about the unconscious, no one before or since has placed so much emphasis on unconscious processes in explaining human behavior. Similarly, when we wonder whether our dreams reveal inner fears and desires, we are espousing an idea Freud popularized. Although people have interpreted dreams for thousands of years, Freud was the first to incorporate dream interpretation into a larger psychological theory.

References to Freudian theory permeate our culture. As one writer put it, “Freud’s theories of the subconscious mind ... have had a dramatic impact on contemporary film, theater, novels, political campaigning, advertising, legal argument and even religion” (Fisher, 1995). English students learn Freudian psychology when studying the themes in great literature; theology students debate Freud’s views on religion. Even our language has not escaped. It is not uncommon to hear people mention Freudian slips, denial, libido, repression, and other Freudian concepts in everyday conversations. But perhaps the most telling tribute to Freud’s impact is that nearly every major theorist covered in this book has felt compelled to use Freud’s works as a point of comparison for his or her own ideas about the nature of personality. Appropriately, this chapter begins with an examination of Freud’s theory of personality.

**Freud Discovers the Unconscious**

How did a Viennese neurologist come to change the way we think of human-kind? There is little in Freud’s early history to indicate that greatness awaited him. Although Freud was a respected member of the medical community, his interests began to drift. In 1885 he went to Paris to study with another neurologist, Jean-Martin Charcot. Charcot was experimenting with early versions of hypnosis and its use in curing what were then believed to be unusual
physiological problems. Shortly thereafter, Freud returned to Vienna and began work with a prominent physician, Joseph Breuer. Like Charcot, Breuer was using hypnosis to treat hysterical patients. Hysteria is a disorder that consists of a variety of physical symptoms. Patients often display blindness, deafness, an inability to walk or to use an arm, and so on. Most physicians of that day treated hysteria as if it were a physically based illness. However, Breuer and Freud developed another interpretation.

Discussions about one of Breuer’s patients, a woman with the pseudonym Anna O., probably set the direction for the rest of Freud’s career. According to Breuer, Anna O. experienced a number of hysterical symptoms, including paralysis of her left arm, hallucinations, and the ability to speak only in English even though her native tongue was German. Under hypnosis, Anna O. would talk about her daydreams and hallucinations and about past traumatic events. During her final hypnosis session, she discussed her dying father and some associated hallucinations about a black snake. After this session, the paralysis in her arm was gone, and she could once again speak German.

In 1895 Freud and Breuer published *Studies in Hysteria*, in which they presented the case of Anna O. and discussed their use of hypnosis in treating hysteria. Freud continued to use hypnosis to treat his hysterical patients, but he soon grew disillusioned with its limitations and began looking for alternative methods. Slowly he recognized the importance of allowing patients to say whatever came into their mind. He discovered that, even without hypnosis, under the right circumstances patients would describe previously hidden material that seemed related to the causes and cure of their hysterical symptoms. Refinement of this technique, called free association, was a significant step in the development of Freud’s theory.

One startling discovery Freud reported in his early patients was that memories uncovered during free association often concerned traumatic sexual experiences, many of which supposedly had occurred in early childhood. He gradually concluded that these early sexual experiences were responsible for the hysterical symptoms expressed by his adult patients. At this point Freud was well along the way in his transition from neurologist to psychologist. He continued to work with hysterical patients and wrote about his observations and the development of his theories, convinced that he was on the threshold of important psychological discoveries.

But Freud’s writings sold poorly at first. In fact, his work met with great opposition in the academic and medical communities. Freud’s open discussion of infantile sexuality and omnipresent sexual motives did not sit well with the puritanical standards of Victorian Europe. His approach to treatment was so radical that many respected physicians considered it absurd. Nonetheless, Freud continued his work and his writing and soon developed a small following of scholars who traveled to Vienna to study with him. These scholars formed the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, with Freud as its great figurehead and leader. Later, many members of the society would come to disagree with Freud and leave the ranks to develop their own personality theories and form their own professional organizations. However, as later chapters will reveal, the flavor of their theories remained unmistakably Freudian.
Sigmund Freud was born in 1856 in Freiberg, Moravia (now part of the Czech Republic). In 1860 his family moved to Vienna, where Freud spent virtually the rest of his life. Freud’s ambition to amount to something important surfaced early. He enrolled in medical school at the University of Vienna determined to make an important discovery and thereby a name for himself.

Freud began his quest while working in his instructor’s medical laboratory. But immediate scientific breakthroughs were not forthcoming, and he soon became discouraged at his chances for advancement. In addition, he had fallen in love with Martha Bernays and wanted to earn enough money to marry her and give her a comfortable lifestyle. So, upon completing his degree, Freud left the lab and went into private practice.

During his subsequent 4-year engagement to Bernays (they were finally married in 1886), Freud won a research grant to travel to Paris to observe Jean-Martin Charcot’s work with hypnosis. It was during this time that he began to develop his ideas about the power of the unconscious mind. His work with Joseph Breuer, observations of his own patients, and a great deal of introspection led to his 1900 book, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Although it took several years to sell the 600 original printings, the book’s publication was the first step toward achieving the widespread recognition Freud had sought back in medical school.

Something about Sigmund Freud has attracted the attention of numerous biographers. The most complete of these is the three-volume biography by Ernest Jones (1953–1957). Although he sought fame, in many ways Freud was a private person. Consequently, most biographers have glued together the facts we have about Freud’s life with a large amount of speculation. Perhaps the most interesting part of this speculation concerns the extent to which Freud’s description of human personality reflects his own personality and life experiences. Not surprisingly, Freud’s relationship with his parents is of particular interest. Although his father had several children from an earlier marriage, Sigmund was his mother’s first child and apparently the apple of her eye. His mother was only 21 when he was born and almost as close in age to her son as she was to her husband. Biographers agree that an especially close relationship was formed. Freud’s mother sometimes referred to him as her “Golden Sigi.” In contrast, Freud’s relationship with his father appears to have been cold, if not occasionally hostile. Freud arrived late to his father’s funeral, something he later identified as clearly unconsciously motivated. Freud struggled with guilt feelings over his relationship with his father many years after his father’s death.

It is not difficult to see how Freud’s description of the Oedipus complex—sexual attraction for the mother and competitive hostility toward the father—may have been a kind of projection of his own feelings toward his parents. Freud hints at this insight at many places in his writings. Indeed, he often relied on his own introspection to test the accuracy of his clinical intuition. He is reported to have reserved a half hour each night for this self-analysis.

Freud’s marriage was a long and relatively happy one, producing six children. The youngest child, Anna, held a special place in her father’s heart. She followed in his professional footsteps, eventually taking over a leadership role in the psychoanalytic movement and becoming a respected psychoanalytic theorist in her own right. Freud created a situation filled with interesting Oedipal possibilities when he conducted Anna’s psychoanalysis himself.

Freud and his family fled from their home and Nazi persecution when Germany invaded Austria in 1938. They escaped to London, where Freud died of cancer the following year.
Gradually, Freud’s ideas gained acceptance within the growing field of psychology. In 1909 Freud was invited to the United States to present a series of lectures on psychoanalysis at Clark University. For Freud the occasion marked the beginning of international recognition of his work. However, resistance to psychoanalysis by academic psychologists kept Freud’s theory out of American textbooks for another quarter of a century (Fancher, 2000). Freud continued to develop his theory and write about psychoanalysis until his death in 1939. Many consider Freud the most influential psychologist in the history of the field. A *Time* magazine cover story at the end of the 20th century featured a picture of Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud, identifying the two as “The Century’s Greatest Minds.”

We begin our examination of this influential perspective by looking at classic Freudian theory. Contemporary advocates of the psychoanalytic approach vary in the degree to which they agree with Freud’s initial descriptions of personality (Westen, 1998). Most accept key psychoanalytic concepts, such as the importance of unconscious thoughts. But modern psychoanalytic psychologists typically back away from other aspects of Freudian theory, such as his description of infantile sexuality. Nonetheless, you need to understand what Freud said before deciding which parts make sense to you and which parts to jettison. More than a century after introducing psychoanalysis to the world, the Viennese neurologist still casts a shadow across the field of personality.

**The Freudian Theory of Personality**

**The Topographic Model**

The starting point for understanding the Freudian approach is the division of the human personality into three parts. Freud originally divided personality into the conscious, the preconscious, and the unconscious. This division is known as the topographic model. The conscious contains the thoughts you are currently aware of. This material changes constantly as new thoughts enter your mind and others pass out of awareness. When you say something is “on your mind,” you probably mean the conscious part of your mind. However, the conscious can deal with only a tiny percentage of all the information stored in your mind. You could bring an uncountable number of thoughts into consciousness fairly easily if you wanted to. For example, what did you have for breakfast? Who was your third-grade teacher? What did you do last Saturday night? This large body of retrievable information makes up the preconscious.

Although many people consider the material in the conscious and preconscious to be fairly exhaustive of the thoughts in their minds, Freud described these as merely the tip of the iceberg. The vast majority of thoughts, and the most important from a psychoanalytic viewpoint, are found in the unconscious. This is material to which you have no immediate access. According to Freud, you cannot bring unconscious thoughts into consciousness except under certain extreme situations. Nonetheless, this unconscious material is responsible for much of your everyday behavior. Understanding the influence of the
unconscious, particularly on what might be termed “abnormal behavior,” is the key to appreciating the psychoanalytic perspective.

The Structural Model

Freud soon discovered that the topographic model provided a limited description of human personality. He therefore added the structural model, which divides personality into the id, the ego, and the superego. Just as you often say, “One part of me wants to do one thing, and another part wants to do something else,” so did Freud conceive of the personality as made up of parts often not at peace with one another.

Freud maintained that at birth there is but one personality structure, the id. This is the selfish part of you, concerned only with satisfying your personal desires. Actions taken by the id are based on the pleasure principle. In other words, the id is concerned only with what brings immediate personal satisfaction regardless of physical or social limitations. When babies see something they want, they reach for it. It doesn’t matter whether the object belongs to someone else or that it may be harmful. And this reflexive action doesn’t disappear when we become adults. Rather, Freud maintained, our id impulses are ever present, held in check by the other parts of a healthy adult personality.

Obviously, if the id were to rely only on reflexive action to get what it wants, our pleasure impulses would be frustrated most of the time. Therefore, Freud proposed that the id also uses wish fulfillment to satisfy its needs. That is, if the desired object is not available, the id will imagine what it wants. If a baby is hungry and doesn’t see food nearby, the id imagines the food and thereby at least temporarily satisfies the need. As discussed later in this chapter, Freud argued that our dreams also are a type of wish fulfillment.

As shown in Figure 3.1, Freud described the id as buried entirely in the unconscious and therefore outside of our awareness. Indeed, because many id impulses center on themes of sexuality and aggression, it is probably good that we are not aware of this unconscious material.

As children interact with their environment during the first 2 years of life, the second part of the personality structure gradually develops. The actions of the ego are based on the reality principle. That is, the primary job of the ego is to satisfy id impulses, but in a manner that takes into consideration the realities of the world. Because id impulses tend to be socially unacceptable, they are threatening to us. The ego’s job is to keep these impulses in the unconscious. Unlike the id, your ego moves freely among the conscious, preconscious, and unconscious parts of your mind.

However, the ego’s function is not simply to frustrate the aims of the id. Freud maintained that human behavior is directed toward reducing tension, such as the tension we feel when impulsive needs—even unconscious ones—are unmet. Very young children might be allowed to grab food off their parents’ plates and thereby reduce tension. But as infants mature, they learn the physical and social limits on what they can and cannot do. Your id impulse may be to grab whatever food is around. But your ego understands this

“In its relation to the id, [the ego] is like a man on horseback, who has to hold in check the superior strength of the horse, [but] is obliged to guide it where it wants to go.”

SIGMUND FREUD*
action is unacceptable. The ego tries to satisfy the wants of the id, and thus lessen tension, but in a way that considers the consequences of the action.

By the time a child is about 5 years old, the third part of the personality structure is formed. The superego represents society’s—and, in particular, the parents’—values and standards. The superego places more restrictions on what we can and cannot do. If you see a $5 bill sitting on a table at a friend’s house, your id impulse might be to take the money. Your ego, aware of the problems this might cause, attempts to figure out how to get the $5 without being caught. But even if there is a way to get the money without being seen, your superego will not allow the action. Stealing money is a violation of society’s moral code, even if you don’t get caught. The primary weapon the superego brings to the situation is guilt. If you take the money anyway, you’ll probably feel bad about it later and may lose a few nights’ sleep before returning the $5 to your friend. Some people have roughly translated the concept of the superego into what is called conscience.

But the superego does not merely punish us for moral violations. It also provides the ideals the ego uses to determine if a behavior is virtuous and therefore worthy of praise. Because of poor child-rearing practices, some children fail to fully develop their superegos. As adults, these people have little inward restraint from stealing or lying. In other people, the superego can become too powerful, or supermoral, and burden the ego with impossible standards of perfection. Here the person could suffer from relentless moral anxiety—an ever-present feeling of shame and guilt—for failing to reach standards no human can meet.

Like forces pulling at three corners to form a triangle, the desires of the id, ego, and superego complement and contradict one another. In the healthy individual, a strong ego does not allow the id or the superego too much control over the personality. But the battle is never ending. In each of us, somewhere below our awareness, there exists an eternal state of tension between
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**FIGURE 3.1 Relationship of the Id, Ego, and Superego to the Three Levels of Awareness**
a desire for self-indulgence, a concern for reality, and the enforcement of a strict moral code.

**Libido and Thanatos**

The topographic model provides the playing field; the structural model provides the characters. But what sets Freud’s system in motion? Freud maintained that human behavior is motivated by strong internal forces he called Triebe, roughly translated as drives or instincts. Freud identified two major categories of instincts: the life or sexual instinct, generally referred to as *libido*, and the death or aggressive instinct, known as *Thanatos*. Although Freud originally maintained that these forces were in opposition, he later suggested that the two often combine, thus intertwining much of what we do with both erotic and aggressive motives.

Freud attributed most human behavior to the life or sexual instinct. However, he used this description in a very broad sense. Sexually motivated behaviors not only include those with obvious erotic content but also nearly any action aimed at receiving pleasure. Late in his career Freud added the death instinct—the desire we all have to die and return to the earth. However, this unconscious motive is rarely expressed in the form of obvious self-destruction. Most often, the death instinct is turned outward and expressed as aggression against others. The wish to die remains unconscious.

Freud was greatly influenced by the scientific thought of his day. Among the ideas he adapted from other sciences was the notion of a limited amount of energy. Energy within a physical system does not disappear but exists in finite amounts. Similarly, Freud argued that we each have a finite amount of psychic energy that more or less powers the psychological functions. This means that energy spent on one part of psychological functioning is not available for other uses. Thus, if the ego has to expend large amounts of energy to control the id, it has little energy left to carry out the rest of its functions efficiently. One goal of Freudian psychotherapy is to help troubled clients release unconscious impulses being held in check, thereby freeing up energy for daily functioning.

**Defense Mechanisms**

Freud’s description of our unconscious minds can be a bit unsettling. Classic psychoanalytic cases involve such unconscious themes as hatred for one’s parents, aggression toward one’s spouse, incestuous thoughts, memories of traumatic childhood experiences, and similar notions too threatening for awareness. The ego attempts to reduce or avoid anxiety by keeping this material out of consciousness. Occasionally, people experience what Freud called *neurotic anxiety*. These are vague feelings of anxiety sparked by the sensation that unacceptable unconscious thoughts are about to burst through the awareness barrier and express themselves in consciousness.

Fortunately, the ego has many techniques at its disposal to deal with unwanted thoughts and desires. These are known collectively as defense mechanisms. Some of the principal defense mechanisms are reviewed in the
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“*Freud recognized that most of what is real within ourselves is not conscious, and that most of what is conscious is not real.*”

**Erich Fromm**
following sections. Freud touched on each of these concepts at various places in his works. However, descriptions of many of the defense mechanisms were developed more completely by some of his followers. Among the later psychoanalysts who extended Freud’s ideas about defense mechanisms was Anna Freud, Sigmund’s daughter.

**Repression**

Freud called repression “the cornerstone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests” (1914/1963, p. 116). It is clearly the most important of the defense mechanisms. Repression is an active effort by the ego to push threatening material out of consciousness or to keep that material from ever reaching consciousness. For example, one night a boy sees his father physically assault his mother. When later asked about the experience, the boy insists he has never seen anything at all like that. He may not be lying. Instead, he may have found the scene too horrifying to accept and therefore simply repressed it out of consciousness. According to Freud, each of us uses repression, for we all have material in our unconscious mind we would rather not bring into awareness. As efficient as this seems, it is not without cost. Because repression is a constant, active process, it requires that the ego constantly expend energy. Repressing a large number of powerful thoughts and impulses leaves our ego with little remaining energy with which to function. And without a strong ego, the battle for a stable personality can be lost.

**Sublimation**

Unlike repression, which drains our ability to function, the more we use sublimation, the more productive we become. Thus psychoanalysts often refer to sublimation as the only truly successful defense mechanism. When using sublimation, the ego channels threatening unconscious impulses into socially acceptable actions. Aggressive id impulses can be sublimated by playing hockey or football. In our society, aggressive athletes are often considered heroes and rewarded for their actions. The sublimation is productive because the id is allowed to express its aggression, the ego doesn’t have to tie up energy holding back the impulses, and the athlete is admired for aggressive play.

**Displacement**

Like sublimation, displacement involves channeling our impulses to non-threatening objects. Unlike sublimation, displaced impulses don’t lead to social rewards. For example, as the result of mistreatment or abuse, a woman might carry around a great deal of unconscious anger. If expressing that anger toward her abuser is unacceptable or dangerous, she might instead direct her emotions toward her coworkers or children. Although doing so can create other problems, angry outbursts aimed at these less-threatening people may protect unacceptable thoughts from conscious expression. Freud maintained that many of our apparently irrational fears, or phobias, are merely symbolic displacements. He once speculated that a fear of horses expressed by a client’s son was really a displaced fear of the father.
Denial
When we use denial, we refuse to accept that certain facts exist. This is more than saying we do not remember, as in repression. Rather, we insist that something is not true despite all evidence to the contrary. A widower who loved his wife deeply may act as if she were still alive long after her death. He may set a place for her at the table or tell friends that she is just away visiting a relative. To the widower, this charade is more acceptable than admitting consciously that his wife has died. Obviously, denial is an extreme form of defense. The more we use it, the less in touch with reality we are and the more difficulty we have functioning. Nonetheless, in some cases the ego will resort to denial rather than allow certain thoughts to reach consciousness.

Reaction Formation
When using reaction formation, we hide from a threatening unconscious idea or urge by acting in a manner opposite to our unconscious desires. Thus, a young woman who constantly tells people how much she loves her mother could be masking strong unconscious hatred for the mother. People who militantly get involved with antipornography crusades may hold a strong unconscious interest in pornography. It is as if the thought is so unacceptable that the ego must prove how incorrect the notion is. How could a woman who professes so much love for her mother really hate her deep inside?

According to Freud, participation in aggressive sports allows the expression of unconscious aggressive impulses in a socially acceptable manner. Football players might be engaging in sublimation with each tackle.
**Intellectualization**

One way the ego handles threatening material is to remove the emotional content from the thought before allowing it into awareness. Using intellectualization—that is, by considering something in a strictly intellectual, unemotional manner—we can bring previously difficult thoughts into consciousness without anxiety. Under the guise of pondering the importance of wearing seat belts, a woman might imagine her husband in a gruesome automobile accident. A Freudian therapist might guess that the woman holds some unconscious hostility toward her spouse.

**Projection**

Sometimes we attribute an unconscious impulse to other people instead of to ourselves. This defense mechanism is called projection. By projecting the impulse onto another person, we free ourselves from the perception that we are the one who actually holds this thought. The woman who thinks everyone in her neighborhood is committing adultery may be harboring sexual desires for the married man living next door. The man who declares that the world is full of distrustful and cheating people may unconsciously know that he is distrustful and a cheater.

**Psychosexual Stages of Development**

Among the most controversial aspects of Freud’s theory is his description of personality development. Freud argued that our adult personalities are heavily influenced by what happens to us during the first 5 or 6 years of life. Each child is said to progress through a series of developmental stages during these years. Because the chief characteristic of each stage is the primary erogenous zone, and because each stage has a specific influence on the adult personality, they are referred to as the psychosexual stages of development.

Freud maintained that children face specific challenges as they pass through each of the psychosexual stages and that small amounts of psychic energy are used up resolving these challenges. If all goes as it should, most of us still have an adequate amount of psychic energy left to operate a healthy personality by the time we become adults. But sometimes things go awry. Some children have a difficult time moving through a particular stage (or, for a few, find the stage excessively satisfying and wish to stay there). The result is fixation, the tying up of psychic energy. Not only does this leave less energy available for normal adult functioning, the adult is said to express behaviors characteristic of the stage at which the energy is fixated.

The first stage in Freud’s model is the oral stage. During this period, which spans approximately the first 18 months of life, the mouth, lips, and tongue are the primary erogenous zones, that is, the source of pleasure. You need only watch a 6-month-old for a few minutes to realize that everything must go into the mouth. Traumatic weaning or feeding problems during this stage can result in fixation and the development of an oral personality.
Repressed Memories

One afternoon in 1969, 8-year-old Susan Nason disappeared on her way to visit a neighbor in Foster City, California. Two months later, her body was found in a nearby reservoir. The coroner concluded that Susan had died from a fractured skull. An investigation followed, but with little evidence to go on, police never found the killer. Twenty years later, Eileen Franklin-Lipsker, a childhood friend of the victim’s, sat with her daughter in her Los Angeles home. Suddenly Franklin-Lipsker recalled images of Susan’s death. She could see a man sexually assaulting the girl and then smashing her head with a rock. Franklin-Lipsker also knew the identity of the man in her memories—it was her own father, George Franklin.

Based on little more than his daughter’s testimony, in 1990 George Franklin was tried and convicted for Susan Nason’s murder. Jurors who listened to Franklin-Lipsker’s testimony were convinced she could not have known the details she provided unless she had been at the scene of the crime. But why had the memories taken 20 years to surface? The prosecution argued that the nature of the memories was so traumatic Franklin-Lipsker had repressed them into an unconscious part of her mind. It was noticing the physical similarity between her daughter and Susan that triggered the long-repressed images and allowed them to enter consciousness. Superior Court Judge Thomas Smith called George Franklin “wicked and depraved” and sentenced him to life in prison. Franklin thus became the first person to be convicted on the basis of “repressed” memories.

The Franklin verdict provides an egregious example of how psychological principles can be misused. In this case, a handful of psychotherapists tore apart thousands of families by misapplying the psychoanalytic notion of repression (Brody, 2000). Over a period of several years in the 1990s, a huge number of adults going through psychotherapy suddenly “recalled” childhood memories of being victimized by parents, often sexually. In virtually every case, the client had not been aware of any such experience until the therapist suggested the event. In response to the near epidemic of repressed memory cases, many personality psychologists and memory researchers raised questions about the accuracy of the clients’ claims. Researchers demonstrated that people often have great confidence in the accuracy of repressed memories that could not possibly have been true.

The fall of the repressed memory epidemic came quickly. Parents and family members falsely accused of abuse formed the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. Within the first year, the organization grew to include more than 3,000 families. Hundreds of clients came to see that their memories of abuse were in fact fictional creations and retracted their stories (de Rivera, 1997). But the issue has not gone away. New accusations of abuse based on suddenly remembered images still lead to occasional arrests and prosecutions (“Massachusetts: Court Upholds Ex-Priest’s Conviction,” 2010; Saulny, 2009; Zezima & Carey, 2009). Psychologists and the courts continue to grapple with questions surrounding repressed memories (Geraerts et al., 2009; McNally & Geraerts, 2009). Although psychologists have demonstrated that people often believe memories that are false, they cannot rule out the possibility that some cases of repressed memories might be based on fact.

In the meantime, prosecutors have revisited old cases that may have been unfairly decided on the basis of repressed memories. A man in Kentucky had his conviction thrown out after he had already served 5 years in prison (Dunbar, 2006). A man in Pennsylvania was granted a new trial after 12 years in prison (Conti, 2005). A federal judge in Nebraska voided a $1.75 million judgment against a clergyman accused of sexual abuse (Zezima & Carey, 2009). After more than 5 years in prison, George Franklin also was granted a new trial. His attorneys argued that the jury in the first case should have been allowed to see newspaper and television reports of Susan’s death. Those reports contained details of the crime that could have been the basis of Franklin-Lipsker’s memories. Prosecutors responded to the new information by dropping the charges. After serving several years for murder, George Franklin was released from prison.
According to Freud, adult oral personalities develop when traumatic childhood experiences cause the fixation of an excessive amount of psychic energy at the oral stage of development. Smoking, drinking, and excessive eating are characteristic of an oral personality.

Like a child, adults with an oral personality tend to be dependent on others, although fixation that occurs after the teething may instead result in excessive levels of aggression. People with an oral personality often express an infantile need for oral satisfaction. They may smoke or drink excessively and are constantly putting their hands to their mouth.

When children reach the age of about 18 months, they enter the anal stage of development. According to Freud, the anal region becomes the most important erogenous zone during this period. Not coincidentally, this is the time most children are toilet trained. Traumatic toilet training can result in fixation and an anal personality. An adult with an anal personality can be orderly, stubborn, or generous, depending on how the toilet training progressed.

Next comes the phallic stage, approximately ages 3 to 6, when the penis or clitoris becomes the most important erogenous zone. The key development during the phallic stage comes toward the end of this period when the child experiences the Oedipus complex, named for the Greek mythological character who unknowingly marries his mother. Freud argued that children this age develop a sexual attraction for their opposite-sex parent. Young boys
have strong incestuous desires toward their mothers, whereas young girls have these feelings toward their fathers.

Needless to say, the children are not without their share of fear about this development. Boys develop *castration anxiety*, a fear that their father will discover their thoughts and cut off their penis. If the boy has seen his sister’s genitals, he is said to conclude that this fate has already befallen her. Girls, upon seeing male genitals, are said to develop *penis envy*. This is a desire to have a penis, coupled with feelings of inferiority and jealousy because of its absence.

How do boys and girls resolve this conflict? Eventually the children repress their desire for their opposite-sex parent, whom they realize they can never have as long as the other parent is around. Then, as a type of reaction formation, children identify with the same-sex parent. Resolving the Oedipus complex serves several important functions. By identifying with the same-sex parent, boys begin to take on masculine characteristics and girls acquire feminine characteristics. Moreover, adopting the parents’ values and standards paves the way for the emergence of the superego. However, Freud warned that Oedipal desires are never fully eliminated. Rather, they are merely repressed and have the potential to influence our behavior later in life in a number of ways. Businessmen who aggressively go after rivals are said to be expressing Oedipal urges left over from their earlier competition with their father.

After resolving the Oedipus complex, the child passes into the *latency stage*. Sexual desires abate during these years. Boys and girls seem fairly
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*After resolution of the Oedipus complex, children pass into the latency stage.*
*For several years, boys will prefer to play with other boys, and girls with other girls. All of this ends with puberty.*
uninterested in each other during the latency stage. A look at any playground will verify that boys play with other boys and girls play with other girls. But all of that changes with puberty. Erogenous urges return and are focused in the adult genital regions. If a child has progressed to this genital stage without leaving large amounts of libido fixated at earlier stages, normal sexual functioning is possible.

**Getting at Unconscious Material**

At first glance, it would appear that Sigmund Freud created a problem for himself. If the most important psychological material is buried in the unconscious and therefore outside of our awareness, how can psychologists study it? Moreover, how can a psychotherapist help his or her clients when the key to understanding the client’s problems is unavailable for inspection? Not surprisingly, Freud had an answer to this dilemma. He maintained that strong id impulses do not simply disappear when they are pushed out of consciousness. Although the true nature of these impulses is repressed by a strong ego, the impulses are often expressed in a disguised or altered form. If psychologists know what to look for, they can catch a glimpse of unconscious thoughts by observing seemingly innocent behaviors. The following are seven techniques a Freudian psychologist might use to get at unconscious material.

**Dreams**

Freud called dreams the “royal road to the unconscious.” In 1900 he published *The Interpretation of Dreams*, presenting for the first time a psychological theory to explain the meaning of these nighttime dramas. According to Freud, dreams provide id impulses with a stage for expression. They are, in fact, a type of wish fulfillment; our dreams represent the things we desire. This is not to say that we want the unpleasant and frightening things we sometimes dream about to literally come true. Freud drew a distinction between the manifest content of a dream (what the dreamer sees and remembers) and the latent content (what is really being said). Overt expression of many unconscious desires would be difficult to face upon waking. That’s why they were repressed in the first place. However, these unacceptable images can surface in disguise in our dreams. Freud maintained that many of our unconscious thoughts and desires are represented symbolically. Dreams involving penises, sexual intercourse, and vaginas might be threatening to the dreamer. But we would have no problem with a dream about fountains, airplane rides, or caves. “The dreamer does know what his dream means,” Freud wrote. “Only he does not know that he knows it, and for that reason thinks he does not know it” (1916/1961, p. 101).

Freud believed a trained psychoanalyst could identify many common dream symbols. A house is said to represent the human body, one’s parents are disguised as a king and queen, children are represented as small animals, birth is associated with water, a train journey is a symbol for dying, and clothes and uniforms represent nakedness. Predictably, the vast majority of Freudian dream symbols are sexual. For example, male genitals are said to be represented by objects with a similar shape. Freud (1916/1961) listed several
common phallic symbols, including sticks, umbrellas, trees, knives, rifles, pencils, and hammers. Female genitals are symbolically represented by bottles, boxes, rooms, doors, and ships. Sexual intercourse is hidden in such activities as dancing, riding, and climbing. In fact, reading Freud’s long list of symbols, it’s hard to think of many dreams that can’t be interpreted sexually.

**Projective Tests**

We have all played the game of finding images in cloud formations. One person might describe a sailboat, another sees the Cowardly Lion, and a third can just make out a couple dancing the tango. Of course, there are no real pictures in the clouds. So where are these images coming from? The answer, from a Freudian perspective, is that these responses are projections of material in the perceiver’s unconscious mind. The images we see in vague objects like clouds represent another way of getting at unconscious material. **Projective tests** present test takers with ambiguous stimuli and asks them to respond by identifying objects, telling a story, or perhaps drawing a picture. The responses are said to provide insights into what is going on in the unconscious. Some of the projective tests used by psychologists are reviewed later in this chapter.

**Free Association**

Try this exercise some time. Take a few minutes to clear your mind of thoughts. Then allow whatever comes into your mind to enter. Say whatever you feel like saying, even if it is not what you expect and even if you are a little surprised or embarrassed by what comes out. If you find strange, uncensored ideas flowing into your awareness, you may be experiencing free association. Clients undergoing psychoanalysis are often encouraged to use free association to temporarily bypass the censoring mechanism the ego employs. Ordinarily we block distasteful, seemingly trivial or silly thoughts to protect ourselves from this material or to keep from sounding foolish. But if we can slip by the ego’s roadblocks and obstacles, even for a moment, glimpses into the unconscious may be possible.

However, free association is usually not so easy. The ego has invested considerable energy to repress threatening thoughts and is not likely to let them just ease into consciousness. Occasionally clients slip into long silences. Sometimes they report that nothing comes to mind or endlessly describe unimportant details in an effort to avoid any unconscious revelations. But when the client gives expression to whatever enters his or her awareness, both client and therapist are often surprised by what emerges.

**Freudian Slips**

We all occasionally make slips of the tongue. A husband might refer to his wife by her maiden name or say that her mind is really her “breast” feature. These slips can be embarrassing and funny, but to Freud they represented unconscious associations that momentarily slipped out. The husband who uses his wife’s maiden name may unconsciously wish he’d never married this woman. We call these misstatements Freudian slips.
**Hypnosis**

Freud’s early experiences with hypnosis told him there was more to the human mind than what we can bring into awareness. He came to believe that the ego was somehow put into a suspended state during a deep hypnotic trance, which allowed the hypnotist to bypass the ego and get directly to unconscious material. When people asked Freud for proof of the unconscious, he often pointed to hypnosis. “Anyone who has witnessed such an experiment,” he wrote, “will receive an unforgettable impression and a conviction that can never be shaken” (1938/1964, p. 285).

If hypnosis is a pipeline to the unconscious, it is easy to see how the procedure would be a valuable tool for psychoanalysts. Yet Freud was quick to acknowledge some drawbacks. Chief among these is that not all clients are responsive to hypnotic suggestion. Moreover, as we will see in Chapter 4, not all psychologists agree with Freud’s description of hypnosis as a pathway to the unconscious.

**Accidents**

Suppose you are having an argument with a friend and you “accidentally” knock off a shelf an irreplaceable statue belonging to that friend. The statue shatters beyond repair. You apologize, saying that you did not mean to do it. But is this really an accident? In Freud’s view, many apparent accidents are in fact intentional actions stemming from unconscious impulses. Freud might argue that you were expressing an unconscious desire to hurt your friend when you broke his or her prized possession. Clients who claim to accidentally forget their regular therapy appointment might be displaying what Freud called *resistance*. Consciously, the clients believe they simply did not remember the appointment. Unconsciously, there has been a deliberate effort to thwart a therapist who may be close to uncovering threatening unconscious material. Similarly, reckless drivers might be setting themselves up for an accident to satisfy an unconscious desire for self-inflicted harm. To Freudian psychologists, many unfortunate events are accidents in the sense that people do not consciously intend them, but not in the sense that they are unintended.

**Symbolic Behavior**

Just like the events we dream, many of our daily behaviors can be interpreted by Freudian psychologists as symbolic representations of unconscious desires. Symbolic actions pose no threat to the ego because they are not perceived for what they are. But they may allow for the expression of unconscious impulses. An excellent example is found in the case of a client who held a great deal of hostility toward his mother, although he would not consciously acknowledge these feelings. To the therapist, the unconscious hostility was expressed through an interesting doormat the client purchased for his home. The doormat was decorated with images of daisies. Not coincidentally, the client’s mother had a favorite flower, the daisy. She had daisies on her dishes and pictures of daisies all around the house. In short, the daisies symbolized the mother. The good son enjoyed rubbing his feet and stomping on the
daisies—symbolically acting out his hostility toward his mother—every time he entered the house.

When we apply Freud’s dream symbols to everyday acts, we can see psychologically significant behavior seemingly everywhere. What can we say about the woman who joins the rifle team? The man who explores caves? The person who constantly borrows pencils without returning them? It is interesting to note that Freud was a habitual cigar smoker who, despite painful operations for cancer of the jaw, continued to smoke until his death. Although the cigar is an obvious phallic symbol, Freud reportedly answered a query about his habit by saying, “Sometimes a cigar is just a cigar.”

**Application: Psychoanalysis**

Not only was Freud the father of psychoanalytic theory, but he was also the first person to outline and advocate a system of psychotherapy. During his early years with Breuer, Freud recognized that many disorders were psychological rather than physical in origin. Through his experimentation with hypnosis, he came to see that the causes of these disorders were buried in a part of the mind not easily accessible to awareness. Slowly Freud developed various methods to get at this material, beginning with hypnosis and gradually changing to free association. As he gained insights into the causes of his clients’ disorders and the structure and functioning of human personality, Freud developed a system of psychotherapy called psychoanalysis.

The primary goal of psychoanalysis is to bring crucial unconscious material into consciousness where it can be examined in a rational manner. However, once the unconscious material surfaces, it must be dealt with in such a way that it does not manifest itself in some new disorder. The therapist and the client work together to help the ego once again exercise appropriate control over the id impulses and the oppressive superego. In some ways, the therapist and the client are like explorers searching through the client’s mind for crucial unconscious material. But the therapist also is like a detective, who must evaluate cryptic messages about the underlying cause of the disorder as the client unconsciously, and sometimes cunningly, works to mislead and frustrate the therapist.

Typically, psychoanalysis clients lie on a couch while the therapist sits behind them, out of sight. The client is encouraged to speak freely, without any distractions from the room or the therapist that might inhibit free association. Unfortunately, the process of digging through layers of conscious and unconscious material, as well as avoiding the obstacles and misdirection thrown in by the threatened ego, is a lengthy one. Clients usually require several hour-long therapy sessions a week for a period of perhaps several years. Consequently, traditional psychoanalysis is expensive and limited to those who can afford it.

The bulk of time spent in psychoanalysis is devoted to getting at the crucial unconscious material causing the disorder. Because the ego has devoted
so much energy and is so strongly motivated to repress the material, this part of therapy can be difficult. Freud used several tactics to get into the unconscious, including free association, dream interpretation, and hypnosis. Unlike other systems of psychotherapy, in psychoanalysis the therapist actively interprets for clients the significance of their statements, behaviors, and dreams. But Freud cautioned that therapists should not reveal true meanings too soon. Beginning therapists are often tempted to interpret the unconscious meaning behind an act or a statement as soon as they perceive it. However, this early insight could be threatening for an unprepared ego, causing the client to construct new and stronger unconscious defenses.

Nonetheless, when the timing is right, the psychoanalyst interprets statements and dream symbols for clients until they understand their true meaning. An excellent example of this is found in one of Freud’s famous case studies, the case of Dora. Dora was an 18-year-old patient from an affluent family. She complained of headaches and other physical problems. One area of trauma for Dora concerned a married couple, who Freud referred to as Mr. and Mrs. K. Mrs. K. was having an affair with Dora’s father. To make matters worse, Mr. K. had made sexual advances toward Dora. One day during therapy, Dora related the following dream:

A house was on fire. My father was standing beside my bed and woke me up. I dressed quickly. Mother wanted to stop and save her jewel-case; but Father said: “I refuse to let myself and my two children be burnt for the sake of your jewel-case.” We hurried downstairs, and as soon as I was outside, I woke up.

(1901/1953, p. 64)

To the untrained ear, the dream seems innocent and meaningless enough, similar to dreams we all have and give little thought to. But for Freud, the dream was filled with clues about the causes of Dora’s problems. With a little questioning, Freud learned that shortly before the dream, Mr. K. had given Dora an expensive jewel case as a present. With this information, Freud had all the pieces to the puzzle he needed. As he explained to Dora,

Perhaps you do not know that “jewel-case” is a favourite expression for the female genitals.... You said to yourself: “This man is persecuting me; he wants to force his way into my room. My ‘jewel-case’ is in danger, and if anything happens it will be Father’s fault.” For that reason in the dream you chose a situation which expresses the opposite—a danger from which your father is saving you. Mr. K. is to be put in the place of your father just as he was in the matter of standing beside your bed. He gave you a jewel-case; so you are to give him your jewel-case.... So you are ready to give Mr. K. what his wife withholds from him. That is the thought which has had to be repressed with so much energy, and which has made it necessary for every one of its elements to be turned into its opposite. The dream confirms once more what I had already told you before you dreamt it—that you are summoning up your old love for your father in order to protect yourself against your love for Mr. K. (p. 69)

Freud interpreted several important psychoanalytic concepts for Dora. He identified her use of symbols and her repression of her true desires. He explained how she used reaction formation—dreaming the opposite of what she really wanted—and how her repressed desires for her father affected her
behavior. Not surprisingly, Dora had difficulty accepting this interpretation at first. As this example illustrates, clients must obtain a reasonable understanding of psychoanalytic theory before they can appreciate the therapist’s interpretation of their dreams, thoughts, and behaviors.

Ironically, one of the first signs that therapy is progressing is the development of resistance. For example, clients might declare that the sessions aren’t helping and that they want to discontinue therapy. Or they might lapse into long silences, return to material already discussed, miss appointments, or insist that certain topics aren’t worth exploring. These attempts at resistance could indicate that the therapist and client are getting close to the crucial material. The threatened ego is desperately attempting to defend against the approaching demise of its defenses as crucial unconscious material is almost ready to burst into consciousness.

Another necessary step in traditional psychoanalysis is the development of transference. Here emotions associated with people from past situations are displaced onto the therapist. For example, a client might talk to and act toward the therapist as if the therapist were a deceased parent. Unconscious emotions and previously undelivered speeches buried deep and long ago are unleashed, feelings that often lie at the heart of the client’s disorder. Freud warned that handling transference was a delicate and crucial part of the therapy process. He also cautioned therapists against countertransference, in which therapists displace their own feelings toward other individuals onto the client.

From the outset, psychoanalysis has been controversial, and the debate about its effectiveness has never ended (Gabbard, Gunderson, & Fonagy, 2002). Nonetheless, although many therapy options are available today, a large number of psychotherapists continue to identify their approach as “psychoanalytic” (Cook, Biyanova, Elhai, Schnurr, & Coyne, 2010; Thoma & Cecero, 2009). Recent reviews of carefully designed studies find evidence that psychoanalytic therapies are often effective when treating a wide variety of psychological disorders (Leichsenring, 2007; Leichsenring & Rabung, 2008; Shedler, 2010). Predictably, these claims of effectiveness have been met with skepticism (Beck & Bhar, 2009; McKay, 2011; Roepke & Renneberg, 2009). Critics also argue that psychoanalysis, if it works, can often take years and therefore is not as cost effective as many short-term therapies. As with most things associated with Freud, it is safe to say this controversy is likely to continue.

**Assessment: Projective Tests**

Psychoanalysts are faced with a unique problem when developing ways to measure the personality constructs of interest to them. By definition, the most important concepts are those the test taker is unable to report directly. If a client can readily describe a psychological conflict, that conflict obviously is not buried deeply in the unconscious and thus is unlikely to be the key to understanding the person’s problem. So how do psychoanalytic therapists and researchers measure unconscious material? The solution is to bypass direct reports altogether.
Projective tests present individuals with ambiguous stimuli, such as inkblots or vague pictures. Test takers respond by describing what they see, telling stories about the pictures, or somehow reacting to the material. The tests provide no clues about correct or incorrect answers, which makes each person's responses highly idiosyncratic. One person may see a circus and an elephant, whereas another identifies a cemetery and a woman in mourning. As the name implies, psychoanalysts consider these responses projections from the unconscious. The ambiguous material gives test takers an opportunity to express pent-up impulses. However, as with other expressions of unconscious impulses, the significance of the response is not apparent to the test taker.

**Types of Projective Tests**

In 1921, Hermann Rorschach published a paper in which he described a procedure for predicting behavior from responses to inkblots. Although Rorschach died the next year at age 38, his work stimulated other psychologists who continued to develop the test that still bears its creator's name. The Rorschach inkblot test consists of 10 cards, each containing nothing more than a blot of ink, sometimes in more than one color. Test takers are
instructed to describe what they see in the inkblot. They are free to use any part of the inkblot and are usually allowed to give several responses to each card. Although some of the cards may be quite suggestive, they are in fact nothing more than inkblots.

Inkblot test responses can be analyzed with any of several scoring systems developed over the years. However, most psychologists probably rely on their personal insights and intuition when interpreting responses. Unusual answers and recurring themes are of particular interest, especially if they are consistent with information revealed during therapy sessions. For example, most therapists would probably take note if a client sees dead bodies, graves, and tombstones on each card. Similarly, clients who see suicidal acts, bizarre sexual behavior, or violent images probably provide therapists with topics to explore in future sessions.

Another widely used projective test is the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). The test was designed by Henry Murray (Chapter 7) and consists of a series of ambiguous pictures. Test takers are asked to tell a story about each picture—who the people are, what is going on, what has led up to the scene, and what the outcome is going to be. Although most of the pictures contain images of people, facial expressions and the nature of the relationship between the people are intentionally vague. Thus test takers may see love, guilt, anger, or grief in the faces. The characters may be fighting, plotting, loving, or unaware of each other. They may be in for a happy, sad, horrifying, or disappointing end to their situation. What the test taker sees in the picture provides clues to the person’s personality. Although therapists often rely on their intuition when interpreting TAT responses, many use relatively objective scoring procedures. Examples of how psychologists use the TAT in research are examined at length in Chapters 4 and 8.

Yet another projective test used by many therapists is the Human Figure Drawing test. Although initially developed in the 1920s as a measure of intelligence, psychologists soon recognized that the test also seemed to measure important personality constructs (Handler, 1996). The ambiguous stimulus here consists of a blank piece of paper and the instructions to draw a picture for the psychologist. In many cases, test takers are simply asked to draw a person, but sometimes psychologists instruct them to draw a family or a tree. The Human Figure Drawing test has many uses, including a measure of intelligence in children. However, most often it is used as an indicator of psychological problems, particularly in children (Bardos & Powell, 2001; Matto, 2002). Psychoanalysts typically view the person drawn by the test taker as a symbolic representation of the self.

The notion that children’s drawings provide a peephole into their inner thoughts and feelings has strong intuitive appeal. Schoolteachers often take note of children who never seem to draw smiles on the faces of the characters they sketch. Similarly, children who frequently draw monsters or ghoulish creatures could be expressing some disturbing inward feelings. A glance at the drawings by emotionally disturbed children presented in Figure 3.2 makes a persuasive case that children sometimes express through drawing what they otherwise might not put into words.
Hundreds of studies have been conducted with projective tests, most often with the Rorschach inkblot test. Responses to the inkblots have been used to predict everything from intelligence to sexual orientation. Unfortunately, psychologists disagree on how to interpret this research (Garb, Wood, Lilienfeld, & Nezworski, 2005). Critics point to unacceptably low indices of reliability and frequent failures to find evidence for the validity of the test (Wood, et al., 2010; Wood, Nezworski, & Stejskal, 1996, 1997). One team...
of reviewers concluded that “there is currently no scientific basis for justifying the use of Rorschach scales in psychological assessment” (Hunsley & Bailey, 1999, p. 266). Another said bluntly that the Rorschach inkblot test was “not a valid test of anything” (Dawes, 1994, p. 146). Some psychologists challenge whether the inkblot procedure should be described as a test at all. They argue that the Rorschach is more accurately characterized as a highly structured interview.

But there are two sides to every controversy. Advocates for the Rorschach test raise several important points in its defense. First, one needs to separate good studies designed to test appropriate predictions from poor studies that attempt to tie test responses to any and all behaviors (Weiner, 1995, 1996). When reviewers look at results from sound studies making reasonable predictions, they find evidence for the usefulness of the test (Choca, 2013; Gronnerod, 2004; Mihura, Meyer, Dumitrascu, & Bombel, 2013; Parker, Hanson, & Hunsley, 1988; Viglione, 1999). Moreover, newer, more rigorous systems for coding Rorschach responses have proved far more reliable than earlier methods (Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001; Weiner, 2001). Second, establishing good validity data for projective tests is more difficult than when using other kinds of personality measures. How can we demonstrate empirically that a Rorschach assessment is accurate? If a therapist concludes from an inkblot test that a client has a certain unconscious conflict, what objective criterion does the researcher use to establish the validity of this claim? Indeed, if objective indicators existed, therapists wouldn’t need to use projective tests in the first place.

Despite the controversy, the Rorschach and many other projective tests continue to be widely used (Camara, Nathan, & Puente, 2000; Watkins, Campbell, Nieberding, & Hallmark, 1995). This use extends far beyond psychotherapy. For example, projective tests are often used by school psychologists to evaluate social and emotional adjustment in children (Hojnoski, Morrison, Brown, & Matthews, 2009) and by psychologists working with law enforcement and court officials (Gacono & Evans, 2008). One reason for this popularity is that the tests may uncover information not easily obtained through other procedures. For example, therapists working with children sometimes allow a child to play with a family of dolls. Imagine a child who acts out a drama in which the mother and father dolls are cruel to the child doll. The child might be expressing something about the situation at home that isn’t easily revealed through other means.

Then again, many psychologists warn against overinterpreting responses to projective tests. The child in the previous example could merely be acting out a scene from a recent television program. Because the validity of projective tests remains open to challenge, psychologists usually are advised not to rely heavily on the tests when making diagnoses (Wood, Garb, Lilienfeld, & Nezworski, 2002). Instead, projective test results should be viewed as but one source of information about a client. They should be taken into consideration along with information collected through interviews, observations, case histories, and other psychological tests.
None of the approaches to personality covered in this book can spark an argument as quickly as Freudian theory. Every clinical psychologist and personality researcher has an opinion on the value and accuracy of Freud’s ideas. Although few accept all of Freud’s observations and postulates unquestioningly, adherents of the Freudian view strongly defend the basic assumptions Freud made about the nature of human functioning. Critics tend to be equally passionate in their evaluations.

**Strengths**

Even if all of Freud’s ideas were to be rejected by modern personality theorists, he would still deserve an important place in the history of psychology. Freud’s was the first comprehensive theory of human behavior and personality. Most subsequent personality theorists have found it necessary to point out where their theories differ from or correct weaknesses in Freud’s works. Many of these psychologists built their theories on the foundation laid by Freud, borrowing key psychoanalytic concepts and assumptions. As discussed in Chapter 5, many of those who studied with Freud or were trained in the Freudian tradition went on to develop and promote their own versions of psychoanalytic theory. In short, Freud’s observations set the direction for subsequent personality theory and research. Even recent approaches to personality, although far removed from psychoanalytic theory, are probably influenced in many ways by Freud’s ideas.

Freud also can be credited with developing the first system of psychotherapy. Today, treating psychological disorders through discussions with a therapist is an accepted and widely practiced procedure. Although psychotherapy might have evolved without Freud, it certainly would not have evolved the way it did. Techniques such as free association, hypnosis, and dream interpretation have become standard tools for many therapists. Indeed, some clients are disappointed to find their therapist has no couch and does not plan to hypnotize them or interpret their dreams. Nonetheless, surveys reveal that a large number of young as well as experienced psychotherapists identify their perspective as “psychoanalytic” (Cook et al., 2010; Thoma & Cecero, 2009).

In addition, Freud can be credited with popularizing and promoting important psychological concepts. For example, anxiety plays a key role in the work of many psychotherapists, personality theorists, and researchers from numerous areas of psychology. As discussed in Chapters 4, 6, and 16, many of the topics researched by psychologists today have their roots in one or more of Freud’s concepts, even if they no longer carry much of the Freudian flavor. By placing these concepts on the menu of psychological topics many years ago, Freud influenced the subject matter of personality research today.

**Criticisms**

Although Freud’s ideas were so revolutionary that they were rejected by many in the medical and academic communities at the time, some writers argue that...
Freud’s ideas may not have been so original or groundbreaking after all. For example, one investigator discovered that between 1870 and 1880 at least seven books were published in Europe that included the word unconscious in the title (Whyte, 1978). Because the educated elite in Europe was relatively small, one researcher concluded that “at the time Freud started his clinical practice every educated person must have [been] familiar with the idea of the unconscious” (Jahoda, 1977, p. 132). Other historians point out that Freud probably had access to the works of people already writing about different levels of consciousness, free association, and infantile sexuality (Jahoda, 1977; Jones, 1953–1957). In addition, many Freudian ideas appear in literature that predates Freud’s work. For example, the Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoyevski, who died in 1881, described in his writing such things as unconsciously motivated behaviors, erotic symbolism in dreams, intrapsychic conflict, and even hints of an Oedipus complex.

Three points can be offered in Freud’s defense. First, Freud often cited earlier works on topics similar to the ones he was introducing. This is especially true in his early writings. Second, Freud was the first person to organize many loosely related ideas into one theory of human behavior. Without a unified theory detailing the relationship among the unconscious, dream interpretation, and infantile sexuality, it is doubtful whether any of these notions would have been developed much further by the scientists who were familiar with them. Third, Freud initiated a lifelong program of investigating the various concepts in his theory. The work Freud and his followers did with their clients provided the data on which psychoanalytic theory was developed. Although many of Freud’s contributions may have had precedents in earlier writings, there is a large difference between introducing an idea and organizing, integrating, and developing many ideas into a comprehensive model of human behavior.

A second criticism often made of Freudian theory is that many of the hypotheses generated from the theory are not testable. Recall that one criterion for a useful scientific theory is that it generates hypotheses that can be either supported or not supported with data. But critics question whether Freud’s theory meets this standard. For example, if a Freudian therapist concludes that a client has a strong unconscious hatred for her sister, what sort of evidence would demonstrate that the conclusion is incorrect? What if the client says she cannot remember any negative feelings toward her sister? The client is obviously repressing them. What if the client describes how much she loves her sister? Obviously, this is a reaction formation. And if the client admits she harbors negative feelings toward her sister, then the therapist has been successful in bringing the material into consciousness. If the hypothesis cannot be unsupported, neither can it be truly supported. This makes the theory considerably less useful to scientists.

In Freud’s defense, he can hardly be accused of being unconcerned with finding evidence to support his theory. Indeed, he referred to many parts of his theory as “discoveries,” the products of detailed examinations of clients’ statements during various stages of psychoanalysis. However,
Freud’s heavy reliance on case study data is the basis of another criticism. These data were almost certainly biased. First, Freud’s patients hardly represented typical adults. Not only did they come from relatively wealthy and well-educated European families, but they also were suffering from psychological disorders at the time. It is a large leap to say that the minds of these clients function in the same way as the mind of the average psychologically healthy adult. Second, all the information we have about these clients was filtered through Freud. It is possible that Freud recognized and recorded only the statements and behaviors that supported his theory and ignored or failed to notice those that did not. Third, it is possible that (consciously or unconsciously) Freud caused his patients to say the things he wanted to hear. Psychotherapy clients can be highly vulnerable to accepting whatever a person in a position of authority tells them and may be highly motivated to please that person. It is interesting to note that when interpreting Dora’s dream, Freud wrote that the dream confirmed what he already knew.

A final group of criticisms concerns disagreements with the points of emphasis and tone of Freud’s theory. Many of Freud’s early followers eventually broke away from the group and developed their own theories because they felt Freud ignored or de-emphasized important influences on personality. Some were concerned about Freud’s failure to recognize how experiences beyond the first few years of life could affect personality. Others disagreed with Freud’s emphasis on an instinctual basis for personality at the expense of important social and cultural influences. Still others took issue with Freud’s tendency to concentrate on psychological disorders rather than on daily functioning and positive aspects of personality. As discussed in Chapter 5, many subsequent psychoanalytic thinkers developed theories that corrected some of these limitations and omissions.

Summary

1. The first comprehensive theory of personality was developed by Sigmund Freud about 100 years ago. After working with hypnosis to help patients suffering from hysteria, Freud came to understand the power of unconscious influences on behavior. According to his theory, human personality can be divided into conscious, preconscious, and unconscious parts. In addition, personality can be divided into the id, ego, and superego. Psychological activity is powered by psychic energy, called libido. Intrapsychic conflict creates tension, and the goal of human behavior is to return to a tensionless state.

2. Within Freud’s theory, a healthy personality is one in which the ego controls id impulses and superego demands. To this end, the ego often uses defense mechanisms. These include repression, in which traumatic information is pushed out of awareness. Other defense mechanisms include sublimation, displacement, reaction formation,
denial, intellectualization, and projection. With the exception of sublimation, the ego uses these defense mechanisms at a cost.

3. Among the most controversial aspects of Freud’s theory is his description of the psychosexual stages of development. Freud maintained that young children pass through stages of development characterized by the primary erogenous zone for each stage. Children pass through oral, anal, and phallic stages on their way to healthy sexual expression in the genital stage. Excessive trauma during these early years may cause psychic energy to become fixated, and the adult personality will reflect the characteristics of the fixated stage of development. An important step in the development of adult personality takes place with the resolution of the Oedipus complex at the end of the phallic stage.

4. Psychoanalysts have developed several methods for getting at unconscious material. Freud called dreams the “royal road to the unconscious.” He interpreted the symbols in his patients’ dreams to understand unconscious impulses. In addition, Freudian psychologists use projective tests, free association, and hypnosis to get at this material. Clues about unconscious feelings also may be expressed in Freudian slips, accidents, and symbolic behavior.

5. Freud also developed the first system of psychotherapy, called psychoanalysis. Most of the time in this lengthy therapy procedure is spent bringing unconscious sources of the clients’ problems into awareness. A Freudian therapist actively interprets the true (unconscious) meanings of the clients’ words, dreams, and actions for them. One of the first signs that psychoanalysis is progressing is resistance, in which a client stops cooperating with the therapeutic process in order to halt the therapist’s threatening efforts to bring out key hidden material.

6. Many Freudian psychologists rely on projective tests to measure the concepts of interest to them. Typically, test takers are asked to respond to ambiguous stimuli, such as inkblots. Because there are no real answers, responses are assumed to reflect unconscious associations. The use of projective tests is controversial. Critics point to unacceptably low indicators of reliability and validity. However, if used correctly, these tests may provide insights into clients’ personalities and sources of psychological problems.

7. Among the strengths of the Freudian approach is the tremendous influence Freud had on personality theorists for many years to follow. In addition, Freud developed the first system of psychotherapy and introduced many concepts into the domain of scientific inquiry. Critics point out that many of Freud’s ideas were not new and that many aspects of his theory are not testable. Others criticize his use of biased data in developing his theory. Many of those who studied with Freud also disliked his emphasis on instinctual over social causes of psychological disorders and the generally negative picture he painted of human nature.
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