

SELF-ESTEEM AS RELATED TO AMOUNT
AND LEVEL OF AGGRESSIVE AND
SEXUAL THEMATIC CONTENT

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
CLEASON S. DIETZEL
1970

THESIS



LIBRARY
Michigan State
University





MSU

OVERDUE FINES ARE 25¢ PER DAY
PER ITEM

Return to book drop to remove
this checkout from your record.

2—075

a—118
MAGIC 2

OCT 27 1998

ABSTRACT

SELF-ESTEEM AS RELATED TO AMOUNT AND LEVEL OF AGGRESSIVE AND SEXUAL THEMATIC CONTENT

By

Cleason S. Dietzel

Various research studies have failed to support earlier assumptions that underlying drives are directly expressed in TAT fantasy behavior. The evidence points rather to the operation of certain mediating processes which intervene between the impulse and its overt manifestations.

The present study was designed to examine the level of drive mediation in TAT productions and to study the relationship between these mediational processes and the individual's level of self-esteem. The concept of "regression in the service of the ego" was utilized to make predictions concerning the level of drive expression, drive integration, and drive-modulation in the thematic productions and their relationship to level of self-esteem.

Ninety-one subjects (Ss) wrote stories to selected TAT cards and responded to a self-concept inventory. TAT protocols were rated for: (1) total amount of projected sexual and aggressive drive content, (2) degree of drive integration, and (3) degree of drive socialization. Tetrachoric correlational coefficients between the thematic drive ratings and the self-concept inventory scores were computed.

The major findings were as follows:

(1) Individuals with high self-esteem produce TAT stories with higher levels of sexual and aggressive drive content. High self-esteem Ss also display higher levels of drive integration and drive socialization in their thematic productions.

(2) Individuals with low self-esteem produce TAT stories with lower levels of sexual and aggressive drive content. These low self-esteem Ss tend also to either (a) produce highly descriptive, banal stories with little direct drive expression, or (b) develop stories with higher levels of poorly-integrated, blatantly-unsocialized drive expression.

These findings were interpreted as supporting the assumptions surrounding the role of "regression in the service of the ego" in the projective process. The implications of using this concept as a basis for a "process theory" of the TAT were discussed.

(3) Male and female Ss did not differ significantly in the level of drive expression or drive control on the TAT. In addition, there were no sex differences in level of self-esteem. Female Ss followed the major trends between thematic behavior and self-esteem as reported above. Male Ss, however, obtained correlations between self-esteem scores and drive socialization ratings which were not in the hypothesized directions. A post hoc analysis suggested that "adaptive" males projected more drive with slightly lower levels of socialization which, because of the limitations of the scoring procedure, were rated as unsocialized rather than socialized drive content. When these drive content ratings were re-rated as socialized, significant correlations in the hypothesized directions were obtained.

(4) Several measures of ego control on the TAT were found to be related to the degree of defensiveness on the self-concept inventory. Level of thematic drive integration was directly related to defensiveness ($r_t = .22$, $p < .05$), whereas amount of total drive content was inversely related to defensiveness ($r_t = -.19$, $p < .10$). Level of drive socialization was not significantly related to defensiveness although the trend was in the expected direction ($r_t = .12$). These findings were discussed as supporting Allport's (1965) views that Ss are able to impose similar levels of control on projective and non-projective tests.

Cleason S. Dietzel

It was also pointed out that the present findings represent one of the few reported studies where scores on a projective technique were found to be related, in significant ways, to scores on a paper-and-pencil test.

Future research was considered with an emphasis on utilizing the Pine Drive Content Manual in a study relating fantasy behavior to overt behavior.

Approved

Norman Abeles
Chairman, Thesis Committee

Date

Feb 18 1970

Thesis Committee

Dr. Norman Abeles, Chairman
Dr. A. I. Rabin
Dr. Joseph Reyher

SELF-ESTEEM AS RELATED TO AMOUNT
AND LEVEL OF AGGRESSIVE AND
SEXUAL THEMATIC CONTENT

By

Cleason S. Dietzel

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1970

C(6)457

41-41-70

To my wife, Louise,
who was a constant source of hope and
encouragement during the
entire project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Norman Abeles, my thesis committee chairman, for his creative conceptualizations which served as a catalyst for the study and for his guidance, encouragement, patience, and insights during the entire project. I would also like to sincerely thank Dr. A. I. Rabin and Dr. Joseph Rehyer for their valuable suggestions and support.

And to Dr. L. Messé, who was willing to allow me valuable class time to collect the thesis data, a heartfelt thank you. A special word of thanks also goes to John Phillips, a fellow graduate student and friend, who assisted with the scoring of the thematic protocols.

I would also like to thank the girls in the Graduate Research Office, Department of Psychology, for their excellent typing services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Question of Individual Controls on Projective Techniques	1
Ego Control Operations, Drive Expression, and Projective Test Performance	6
Personality Determinant of Adaptive Regres- sion: The Individual's Self-Evaluations or Level of Self-Esteem	15
Hypotheses to be Tested	20
METHOD	22
Subjects	22
The Instruments.	24
Procedures	31
RESULTS.	33
General Findings	33
Sex Differences.	38
Defensiveness	41
DISCUSSION.	44
Future Research Considerations.	55
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	57
REFERENCES.	61
APPENDICES.	66
Appendix	
A. A Manual for Rating Drive Content in the Thematic Apperception Test	66
B. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale Test Booklet and C & R Answer Packet	75
C. TAT Instructions	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age of <u>Ss</u> by Sex (N = 91)	22
2. Educational Status of <u>Ss</u> , by Sex.	23
3. Inter-rater Agreement for Total Drive Content, Drive Level, and Drive Inte- gration Ratings (N = 30).	28
4. Means and Standard Deviations for Major Variables (N = 91).	33
5. The Relationship Between Total Drive Expres- sion and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)	34
6. The Relationship Between Socialized Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)	35
7. The Relationship Between Unsocialized Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)	36
8. The Relationship Between Highly Constricted Drive Expression and Level of Self- Esteem (N = 91).	37
9. The Relationship Between Degree of Drive Integration and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)	37
10. Differences in Level of Self-Esteem, Total Drive Content, Level of Drive Expression, and Degree of Drive Integration for <u>Ss</u> , by Sex.	38
11. The Relationship Between Level of Self- Esteem and Total Drive Expression, Level of Drive Expression, and Degree of Drive Integration for <u>Ss</u> , by Sex	40

Table	Page
12. Degree of Defensiveness for <u>Ss</u> , by Sex (N = 91)	41
13. The Relationship Between Indices of Ego Control on the TAT and the Degree of Defensiveness on the Self-Concept Inventory.	42

INTRODUCTION

The present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between the level of individual control imposed on TAT fantasy productions (as manifested by the total amount of drive content, degree of drive integration, and level of drive socialization) and level of self-esteem.

The Question of Individual Controls on Projective Techniques

One of the leading debates in the literature on personality assessment has focused on the issue of whether projective and non-projective tests elicit analogous information about the individual. The controversy centers primarily on the question of the degree to which individuals are able to control and modify their responses on each type of instrument. A brief review of the pertinent issues will provide a background for discussing one of the questions which emerged from the debate: a question to which the present study is directed.

During the early 1940's, supporters of the newly-arrived "projectives" expressed the hope that these

indirect techniques would provide a more uncensored picture of personality than the existing paper-and-pencil tests. Proponents of this position (Frank, 1948; Murray, 1965, Abt, 1950) contended that responses on such "direct method" tests as the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values or the MMPI were contaminated by the factors of social desirability and personal censorship. It was apparent that individuals on these tests were able to realize the type of information they were revealing to the examiner. In addition, the instructions made it clear that the responses were personal and self-revealing. As a result, individuals were able to, and often did, control and modify their responses.

Projective techniques, however, were more likely--according to their supporter--to circumvent the individual's defenses and controls. Projective adherents believed that the ambiguity of the stimulus combined with the impersonal instructions provided the testee with little information about how his percepts would be interpreted. This adduced a less guarded response set which resulted in the disclosure of material (i.e., drives, needs, conflicts) from "deeper" levels of the personality. What emerged from this process was, as Abt has termed it, an "x-ray" picture of personality (1950, p. 57).

A number of early validation studies seemed to support the x-ray hypothesis. Atkinson and McClelland

demonstrated that varying intensities of the hunger drive are directly expressed in the thematic content of the subject's TAT protocols. In another study, Feshbach (1955) found that a group of undergraduate subjects who had been insulted by the experimenter expressed significantly more aggression in subsequent TAT stories than a group of subjects who had not been insulted. McClelland, et al. (1953) and Walker, et al. (1958) obtained similar results through the analysis of projective protocols of subjects who were highly motivated by the underlying conditions of ambition and fear.

Opponents, however, have contended that projective techniques are not exempt from the vitiation of individual (ego) controls and that in some cases the two types of assessment procedures yield almost identical material. In a recent review of the literature, Murstein (1965) states: "The original belief that the needs of the subject might be directly transcribed to the projective protocols has been rejected. It is clear that mediating variables relating to ego functions must be studied along with drive level" (p. xvi). He further mentions that-- "the normal individual has proved unusually able to protect his private world from manifesting itself on projective techniques" (p. 1). Allport (1965) likewise asserts that the individual is able to actively impose controls on the projective process and, consequently, is

able, as he is on the paper-and-pencil tests, to determine the extent to which underlying material is exposed to the examiner. Similarly, Lindzey (1958) maintains that projectives do not provide a "royal road to the unconscious" and that it is necessary to study "the ego processes, directive mechanisms, or cognitive controls that intervene between the motive and its expression" (p. 22).

Lazarus (1961) and Murstein (1965) agree that a majority of the research supports these latter views. In an oft-quoted study, Clark (1952) found that showing fraternity men slides of nude females inhibited direct sexual expression on subsequent TAT protocols. In a second experiment, however, where another group of fraternity men were shown the same slides while under the influence of alcohol, the manifest sexual imagery was significantly higher. Clark reasonably interpreted the negative association between sexual arousal and amount of erotic apperceptive fantasy in terms of intervening ego control operations. Other studies where similar results were demonstrated include Gordon (1953), Davids (1955), and Scodel & Lipetz (1957).

Although the original debate continues, there is considerable agreement, in recent years, that the x-ray theory no longer represents an acceptable, viable hypothesis for understanding projective test processes. The majority of clinical and research data points rather to

the operation of certain psychic structures (i.e., ego) which, as Lindzey (1958) has stated, intervene between the underlying drive and its overt manifestations. Needless to say, these developments place the projective enthusiast in a less sanguine position.

In dealing with this dilemma, several different approaches have been suggested. A number of researchers have attempted to devise newer and more subtle methods with the renewed hope of bypassing the individual's controls and censoring abilities. However, as Murstein (1965) indicates, these attempts have led to higher levels of inference with the test data and to conclusions of questionable worth and value.

As an alternative approach, several theorists (Schafer, 1958; Rosenwald, 1968) have suggested that the ego control processes on the existing projective techniques be studied. Since it has become apparent that controls are imposed on the projective process, the important question is no longer whether controls are operating, but whether they are operating in systematic and predictable ways. Schafer (1958), along with several other ego psychologists (Holt, 1958; Pine, 1960), has proposed that variations in level of ego functioning on projective techniques are predictable and should be studied to increase the usefulness of these assessment procedures.

In line with this, the present study was designed to investigate the level of ego functioning on the TAT (as manifested by the amount and level of sexual and aggressive drive expression) and the relationship between these control operations and the individual's level of self-esteem; a phenomenological variable which is cited in the literature as being functionally related. As such, the present study attempted to contribute to a process theory of the TAT.

Ego Control Operations, Drive
Expression, and Projective
Test Performance

In one of his last major works--The Ego and the Id (1923)--Freud elaborated on the ego and its relationship to instinctual impulse expression. Using an analogy, Freud saw the ego as a man on horseback who had the task of adequately controlling the superior strength of the horse (i.e., the intense underlying impulses). In another place, he stated that "the ego develops from perceiving the instincts to controlling them" (1936, p. 76). Cast in this executive role, the ego is conceptualized as that portion of the psychic structure which has, as one of its functions, the responsibility for (1) regulating the extent of impulse motility--in line with Id demands, and (2) modulating the level of impulse expression (i.e., moderation of drive intensity and degree of socialization)--in keeping with superego and environmental demands. It is

clear from his analogy that Freud was concerned primarily with the former Ego-Id dichotomy. It is not surprising then that earlier studies with projective techniques (especially the Clark experiments) tended to be concerned more directly with the relationship between impulse expression and ego functioning.

More recent developments in psychoanalytic ego psychology (Hartmann, 1958; Schafer, 1958) have shifted the emphasis from the Ego-Id relationship to the Ego-Environmental interaction. This shift provides not only a new perspective from which to evaluate ego functioning in general, but also presents a new theoretical framework for understanding projective test processes and accompanying control operations. With these more recent formulations, impulse expression and ego functioning are understood in connection with the adaptive problems of the individual in his environment (Schafer, 1958).

Stated briefly, adaptation is required in those situations where the individual does not possess a previously acquired set of responses. In such a situation, adaptation is facilitated by a temporary downward shift in the level of psychic functioning (Hartmann, 1958). By temporarily lowering controls, the ego gains access to and use of a wide range of forms and content, including instinctual drives, for adaptive purposes. Following this initial inspirational stage, the ego synthesizes and

integrates the primary process material previously acquired (the elaboration stage). This final stage is characterized by a return to "secondary process" modes of functioning. Hartmann purposes that in this process "the ego detours through regression toward adaptation" (Ibid., p. 36). In another place, Kris (1952) speaks of this process as "regression in the service of the ego." Thus far, the concept of "regression in the service of the ego" has been applied both theoretically and empirically to our understanding of such psychological activities as wit, humor, and artistic creativity (Kris, 1952; Schafer, 1958; Pine, 1959; Cohen, 1960; Hersch, 1962; Rogolsky, 1968).

Schafer (1958) ably suggests that the use of this concept be broadened to increase our understanding of ego functioning on projective techniques like the Rorschach or the TAT.* He indicates that differences in level of ego control (and corresponding levels of impulse expression) can be understood in terms of: (1) the adaptive requirements of the particular projective test itself, and (2) the individual's unique capacity for adaptive behavior (i.e., possession of those personality characteristics which permit adaptive regression).

*The TAT was chosen for the present study for several reasons: One, the TAT pictures are only moderately unstructured (as opposed to the Rorschach cards which are highly unstructured) and seemed to more accurately simulate the adaptive requirements of everyday interpersonal situations. Secondly, using the TAT permitted the use of an existing scoring manual (Pine, 1960) for assessing ego control operations.

Schafer continues by pointing out that projectives, unlike paper-and-pencil tests, require considerable adaptive behavior on the part of the testee:

In these projective tests we require the subject to create something--an image or a fantasy. We give him materials or a medium in which to work but he is in many respects put in the position of the creative artist and must find within himself forms of experience and content to elaborate a response (Ibid., p. 133).

It is possible then to conceptualize the TAT, with its vague, impersonal instructions and semi-structured stimuli, as a situation or process requiring a moderate amount of adaptive behavior.

It is apparent, as Schafer points out, that individuals vary greatly in the extent to which they are free to "regress in the service of the ego" (i.e., engage in adaptive behavior). This brings us then to the main point of the thesis; namely, that variations in the level of ego control (and corresponding levels of drive expression) displayed on the TAT can be understood in terms of, and are functionally related to, certain personality characteristics which facilitate or retard the individual's attempts to regress adaptively in the projective process. It is posited that: (1) individuals who possess the personality characteristics which permit adaptive regression will display lower levels of control (and higher levels of ego-modulated drive expressions) in the thematic protocols, (2) individuals who lack these personality characteristics will either (a) maintain relatively high

levels of control (i.e., stories will be highly descriptive with an obvious absence of direct drive derivatives) or (b) give evidence of pathogenic regression with ego-alien drive expressions. What is being suggested here, if such is not already obvious, is that the concept of "regression in the service of the ego" be utilized to account for and predict the level of ego functioning on the TAT.

Recent methodological developments now make it possible to test these assumptions. Pine (1960) has developed a scoring manual for the TAT where levels of ego functioning are assessed in terms of the degree and level of manifest drive content (drive content, as it is used here, refers to the expression of instinctual drives and their derivatives, including aggressive and libidinal drives and partial drives--oral, anal, phallic, genital, exhibitionistic, voyeuristic, sadistic, masochistic, homosexual, and narcissistic).

The Manual includes three main types of ratings. The first of these represents the total number of reasonably direct derivatives of sexual and aggressive drives which appear in ideational form in the manifest content of the TAT stories (i.e., the total drive content (TDC) score). The second two ratings reflect: (1) the degree to which drive content is integrated into the stories, and (2) the degree of drive socialization (Ibid., p. 45).

(1) Drive Integration Ratings.--S's task on the TAT is to tell a story about a picture. Drive content which is used to develop the main theme of the story (thematic ratings) and that which is used to enrich the story (incidental ratings) is interpreted as task-appropriate and allows the inference that adaptive regression has occurred. Side comments, verbal slips involving drive derivatives, and other unrelated expressions of drive (non-appropriate ratings) which are not in accord with the TAT task suggests that pathogenic regression and ego-alien drive expression has occurred.

(2) Level of Drive Expression.--A second index of ego control assesses the degree of drive modulation (i.e., the degree of drive socialization). (A) Direct-socialized (D-S) ratings: D-S ratings include those expressions of drive content where impulses are expressed directly but in socialized ways. Mention of kissing, intercourse between marital partners, verbal fighting, and such, allows the inference that underlying drives are being expressed but the ego is playing an active role in defining the form which the drive takes (i.e., both the inspirational and elaboration stages of adaptive regression are evident in the finished thematic product). Thus, high D-S scores indicate considerable adaptive regression. (B) Direct-unsocialized (D-U) ratings: The expression of primitive, value-violating, and unrestrained

drives (rape, incest, robbery, murder, and such) in the thematic productions indicates that ego functions have been overwhelmed and pathogenic regression has occurred. Conceptually, this may occur where the ego has lost the ability to modulate impulses (as in a psychotic state) or it may happen that following the initial inspirational stage during adaptive regression, the ego is unable to regain control and restore secondary process functioning. Consequently, high D-U scores indicate an inability to regress adaptively. (C) Disguised-indirect (D-I) ratings: D-I ratings permit the inference that a particular drive is an issue for the person, but the drive itself is not expressed. D-I ratings are given in those instances where mention is made of boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, police, soldier, ruler, saloons, illness, and such. High D-I scores reflect the presence of high ego controls with only minimal regression of either kind.

Validation studies, while few in number, support the Manual and the various scoring categories which have been discussed. In addition to the TAT protocols, Pine (1960) obtained a Rorschach protocol, a Wechsler-Bellevue Test, a written autobiography, and an extensive clinical interview from each of the 14 males in the study. Two raters, first independently and then by consensus, used all of these materials to evaluate and then rate each S on six Q-sorts (Affect and Inner States, Thought Processes,

Motives, Defenses, Interpersonal Behavior, Identity, and Self-Attitudes). Final cross-subject rankings were compared by rank correlations to the TAT manual scores.

Pine reports the following favorable results: Ss with high TDC scores tend towards emotionality, expressiveness, and flux. An expressive quality characterizes thinking, communication, and relationships. The expressiveness has distinctly positive and adaptive character including spontaneous affect, insightfulness, and meaningful relationships. In marked contrast, Ss with low TDC scores appear to reflect a pattern of inhibition, over-control, and rigidity. These individuals seem to be out of touch with inner resources; thinking is blocked and control operations seem both excessive and shaky (Ibid., p. 42).

Ss with well-integrated use of drive (high thematic ratings) present a general picture of smooth functioning. Thinking is efficient and proceeds without disruption by anxiety, expressive needs find their outlet through relatively controlled channels, and a basis for steady and adequate personality functioning appears well established. Ss with poorly integrated use of drive material (lower thematic ratings) are characterized by anxiety and disruption of adaptive functions (Ibid., p. 43).

Ss who express drives in direct-socialized ways are characterized by a relatively balanced relationship

between expressive and control processes. This is reflected in a relatively free intellectual and esthetic expressive style, a flexible identity, and adequate controls over impulses. Ss using unmodulated drive expression (high direct-unsocialized ratings) tend toward impulsive discharge, loose thinking, and a fear of loss of control (Ibid., p. 45).

In another study, Pine (1959) explored the relationship between the various drive content scores on the TAT and literary quality of the stories. Pine found a positive relationship ($\rho = .51, p < .01$) between TDC scores and literary quality. Correlations between D-U, D-S, and D-I scores and literary quality were also in the hypothesized directions. However, only the last relationship (D-I and literary quality) had a correlation significant at the .05 level. Pine also demonstrated that literary quality was positively related to thematic ratings ($\rho = .36, p < .05$) and negatively related to non-appropriate ratings ($\rho = -.25, p < .05$); both results were in the hypothesized directions. The findings were interpreted in terms of the individuals ability to "neutralize" instinctual drives for adaptive, creative purposes. The concept of "regression in the service of the ego" was also used to discuss the data.

It would appear, thus, that the Pine Scoring Manual represents a fairly valid procedure for assessing

drive expression and drive control on the TAT, and that it provides an improved method for testing the assumptions about ego functioning which have been discussed.

Personality Determinant of Adaptive Regression: The Individual's Self-Evaluations or Level of Self-Esteem

There is ample theoretical argument and some experimental evidence supporting a connection between the capacity or potential for adaptive regression and the nature of the individual's self-evaluations or level of self-esteem. Schafer (1958) proposes that the process of adaptive regression requires that the individual possess an adequate, positive, secure sense of self. As was mentioned earlier, the inspirational stage of the regressive process is characterized by a lowering of ego controls to allow access to the underlying, more primitive modes of experience. During this period, there is an enlargement of awareness, a blurring of the distinctions between inner and outer, a relaxation of defense, an entrusting of ideas to preconscious and unconscious elaboration, a loss of time and space perspectives, and other regressive tendencies (Ibid., p. 133). In order to be able to tolerate and permit these experiences, Schafer suggests that the individual must possess the sorts of positive self-evaluations which will allow him to transcend the momentary loss of identity. Those who

positively value their abilities and attributes, who feel confident about themselves, and have a sense of who they are, are in a better position, theoretically, to permit a momentary regression where these attributes and self-perceptions are lost. It is as though the positive self-evaluations provide the ego with the "momentary freedom" to lower control operations in order to facilitate increased adaptiveness and competency; attributes which ultimately contribute to increased self-esteem.

In contrast, individuals who lack confidence in themselves, who have negative self-evaluations, and who possess a rather tenuous picture of who they are, are in a psychological position where higher levels of control must be maintained. These individuals maintain higher levels of control to prevent or avoid the anxiety associated with a possible complete loss of self should regression occur. Here, ego boundaries are rigidly maintained to guard against the possibility of losing an already weak sense of self.

Paradoxically, by maintaining high controls, the ego jeopardizes its ability to prevent pathogenic regression. By maintaining high controls the ego fails to gain access to underlying material which not only facilitates adaptation but also leads to the development of more adequate, flexible controls and defenses. Consequently, initial attempts at maintaining high levels of fragile,

rigid, control may fail, leading to pathogenic regression. Theoretically then, individuals with negative self-evaluations should either display relatively high levels of control (with little direct drive expression) on the thematic productions or give evidence of pathogenic regression and ego-alien drive expression.

Digressing briefly, level of self-esteem refers to the positive or negative evaluations that are consciously ascribed to the individual's self-concept. This self-concept is a phenomenological datum which includes those parts of the phenomenological field (i.e., a constellation of perceived attributes and characteristics) which the individual differentiates as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself (Rogers, 1951). Self-concept as it is defined here is similar to Erickson's "ego identity" (1968) or Sullivan's "self-system" (1945).

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS, Fitts, 1965)* was incorporated in the present study to assess level of self-esteem. Fitts reports that individuals with high self-esteem

tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low self-esteem are

*The 100 items on the TSCS represent a rather broad universe of self-conceptualizations tapping one's feelings toward the major sub-systems of physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. In addition, the validity and reliability studies, reported later, support the usefulness of the scale.

doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy; and have little faith or confidence in themselves (Ibid., p. 2).

By expanding our discussion about ego functioning from the TAT to life situations in general, there is additional evidence for the relationships being discussed. (This expansion assumes a direct, positive relationship between fantasy behavior and overt behavior--an issue to be discussed in a later section.) Freud (1914,) quite early, suggested a relationship between ego functioning and level of self-esteem. He posited that as the child develops he relinquishes his primitive feelings of omnipotence, and develops more realistic feelings of self-regard based on actual achievements. In elaborating on these earlier views, Diggory (1966) states:

Freud was never very explicit about the details of the process of (self) evaluation, nor about the terms in which evaluations occurred. From his vague references to the ego's "accomplishments" it can only be inferred that its success in preventing untimely or inexpedient interruptions of actions aimed at gratifying socially forbidden impulses is one of these accomplishments. He (Freud) also clearly regarded the artist's mastering fantasies and diverting energy to the socially acceptable and useful communication of fantasy as an achievement.

Generally, a relatively strong ego, capable of mastering instinctive impulses in accord with the reality and pleasure principles, is an achievement of no mean proportions (pp. 260-61).

Symonds (1968) concurs:

The successfully functioning ego leads to self-confidence, self-assurance, and self-reliance. These qualities are the result of having the ability to meet the demands as defined by others. When one can function adequately so as to meet the approval of

others, then he gains self-esteem and self-confidence. On the other hand, success and failure of the ego are to a degree determined by the adequacy of the self, that is, the individuals concept and valuation of himself. The self is a partial determinant of the ego (p. 87).

Smith (1964), likewise, in an effort to distinguish between ego and self agrees that the "organizing, selective processes" (ego) in the personality are somehow guided by the nature and status of the self and somehow, in turn, (the ego) has an influence on its (the self's) nature and status (p. 235).

Erickson (1968), similar to Freud, purposes that realistic self-esteem is related to the ego's ability to master and integrate the tasks assigned and sanctioned by a particular social reality.

Although Pine (1960) presents some evidence for a relationship between ego functioning on the TAT and level of self-esteem, there has been surprisingly little additional research in this area. He demonstrated a significant positive correlation ($\rho = .84$, $p < .01$) between total drive content on the TAT and "self-concept flexibility."

The relevancy of Pine's findings become more apparent in light of the positive relationship which Taylor and Combs (1952) found between "self-concept flexibility" and level of self-esteem.

Some indirect evidence is also available. Since the ability to regress adaptively is positively related

to creativity (Cohen, 1961; Hersch, 1962; Rogolsky, 1968) and since creativity is positively related to level of self-esteem (Powell, 1964; Sisk, 1967), there is at least an indirect possibility that a positive relationship also exists between the ability to regress adaptively and level of self-esteem.

In light of the lack of cogent research in this area, the present study explored the relationship between ego control operations on the TAT and level of self-esteem. Utilizing the "adaptive regression" hypothesis, the study attempted to demonstrate that levels of control on TAT fantasy productions (as reflected in the amount of projected drive content, level of drive integration, and degree of drive socialization) are related in meaningful ways to the individual's level of self-esteem.

Hypotheses to be Tested

In light of the preceding discussion, five major predictions were investigated:

Hypothesis 1: There is a direct relationship between the total amount of drive expressed (as measured by the Total Drive Content (TDC) Score on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem (as measured by the Total P Score on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale).

Hypothesis 2: There is a direct relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in socially acceptable ways (as measured by the Direct-Socialized (D-S) Drive Content Score on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem.

- Hypothesis 3: There is an inverse relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in unsocialized ways (as measured by the Direct-Unsocialized (D-U) Drive Content Score on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem.
- Hypothesis 4: There is an inverse relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in indirect, highly constricted ways (as measured by the Disguised-Indirect (D-I) Drive Content Score on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem.
- Hypothesis 5: There is a direct relationship between the degree of drive integration (as measured by the weighted proportion of thematic, incidental, and nonappropriate drive ratings on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem.

In addition, the following relationships were of interest in the present study and were explored without specific hypotheses:

- (1) The relationship between sex of subject and level of self-esteem.
- (2) The relationship between sex of subject and
 - (a) the total amount of drive expressed (TDC),
 - (b) the amount of socialized drive expression (D-S),
 - (c) the amount of unsocialized drive expression (D-U),
 - (d) the amount of highly constricted drive expression (D-I), and the degree of drive integration.
- (3) Sex differences on each of the five major relationships studied.
- (4) The relationship between indices of ego control on the TAT and the degree of defensiveness on the self-concept inventory.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects (Ss) for the present study were taken from a college student population. The sample consisted of 91 students enrolled in an advanced undergraduate psychology course at Michigan State University.

TABLE 1.--Age of Ss, by Sex (N = 91)

	<u>Sample</u> N = 91	<u>Male Ss</u> N = 47	<u>Female Ss</u> N = 44
Mean	21.00	20.97	21.02
Variance	4.41	2.09	12.00
t = 0.091 ^a	df = 89	(Edwards, 1967, pp. 209-212.)	
F = 5.75 ^b	df = 43/46		

^aNot significant.

^bp < .01 for a directional hypothesis.

As seen from Table 1, the mean age for all Ss was 21.00 years. Male Ss had a mean age of 20.97 years, whereas female Ss had a mean age of 21.02 years. The difference in mean age for male and female Ss was statistically non-significant.

Age variability among male Ss was negligible (variance = 2.09). Female Ss, however, displayed considerable age variability (variance = 12.00). The difference in variances was statistically significant. The larger variance in age among female Ss was due to the presence of three Ss who were somewhat older than the rest of the sample (ages: 25, 29, and 40).

TABLE 2.--Educational Status of Ss, by Sex

Class Status	Sample N = 91	Male <u>Ss</u> N = 47	Female <u>Ss</u> N = 44
Freshman	0	0	0
Sophomore	16	5	11
Junior	38	19	19
Senior	33	20	13
Graduate	4	3	1
Mean Years of College Completed	3.28	3.44	3.09
$t = 0.245^a$ $df = 89$			

^aNot significant.

As seen in Table 2, the mean years of college completed for all Ss was 3.28. Male Ss had 3.44 years of college while female Ss had 3.09 years of college. The difference in educational status for males and females was statistically nonsignificant.

The sample, therefore, represents a student population composed of upper-level undergraduates who are primarily between the ages of 19 and 21.

The Instruments

As mentioned earlier, the experimental variables were derived from Ss responses to selected cards of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) and to the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).

TAT Cards.--Ego functioning was assessed by rating four (4) TAT stories for drive expression according to the procedures outlined in the Pine "Drive Content" Scoring Manual (1960). The TAT protocols were obtained from Ss written responses to Cards 1, 2, 4, and 13MF. Card 1 is a relatively neutral, non-threatening stimulus (portraying a young boy located in front of a violin) which served as a "warm-up" card for the projective, story-telling process. Cards 2, 4, and 13MF depict both male and female figures in semi-structured interpersonal situations. Normative studies (Eron, 1949; Pine, a personal communication, 1968) have indicated that each of these cards possess considerable "stimulus pull" for stories with aggressive and sexual themes and were therefore appropriate for eliciting the desired data. The cards are sufficiently unstructured however to allow and, in fact, require that the storyteller determine not only the extent to which aggressive or sexual impulses are projected but also the mode in

which these impulses find expression, i.e., ego-constricted, ego-syntonic, or ego-alien ways.

Scoring Procedures.--Actual scoring consisted of a content analysis of the type written transcripts of Ss written stories.* Stated briefly, the scoring procedure involved reading through the entire protocol and underlining each unit of drive content. Since it is possible for drive derivatives to be expressed many times in one story, several rules were followed in selecting the unit to be rated in each instance: (1) expressions of different drives, i.e., sexual followed by aggressive, are rated as separate units; (2) expressions of drive with differing degrees of integration (thematic, incidental, or nonappropriate) are rated separately; (3) a single drive which is expressed at two different levels of socialization (an example: "The couple's argument"--(rated D-S)--"slowly developed into a physical fight."--(rated D-U) is rated only once at the most extreme level; (4) drive expressions with the same level of socialization or same degree of integration are related separately if new behavior sequences are described or if the expressed impulse has a new aim.

*Appendix A contains the Pine Manual utilized in the present study along with operational definitions of scoring categories and procedures. Several scoring examples are also included.

Once the actual number of drive units in a protocol are located and decided upon, they are rated for level of drive expression (1. direct-socialized, 2. direct-unsocialized, or 3. disguised-indirect) and degree of drive integration (1. thematic, 2. incidental, or 3. nonappropriate).

Following these procedures, each S obtained seven (7) summary scores: a score representing the total number of drive content ratings in the four (4) thematic productions (TDC); one score each for the total number of D-S, D-U, and D-I ratings; and one score each for the number of thematic, incidental, and nonappropriate ratings.

Statistical work on Hypothesis 1 was conducted using the actual distribution of TDC scores obtained. Theoretically, the range in TDC scores is from 0 to an infinitely large number.

The total of the three levels scores is equal to the TDC score. Since the sub-scores are therefore not independent of the total number of drive content ratings, it was necessary to hold total drive content constant in statistical work with the sub-scores. Consequently, to make inter-individual comparisons on level of drive expression and to evaluate Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4, the D-S, D-U, and D-I scores were converted to proportions. As a result, the theoretical range in scores on these three variables was from 0 to 100.

10. 11. 2023

To test Hypothesis 5, concerning drive integration, a weighted composite score was utilized. Weighting the instances of drive integration (three times the number of thematic ratings plus two times the number of incidental ratings plus the number of nonappropriate ratings), dividing by the total number of ratings, and multiplying by a constant $K = 100$, gives a score which represents a trend toward well-integrated drive content at the one extreme (higher scores) and poorly integrated drive at the other extreme (lower scores) with a theoretical range between 0 and 300 (Pine, 1960, p. 36).

Scoring Reliability.--Inter-rater reliability was established by two raters--the present author and another second year graduate student. As a preliminary step, both raters studied the Pine Manual. Following this, an extensive period of rating practice was carried out using protocols from another source. During this training period, scoring discrepancies were discussed and resolved in accord with the general guidelines of the Manual. The reliability sample ($N = 30$) was randomly selected and independently rated after a satisfactory degree of inter-rater agreement was achieved. Table 3 lists the reliability results.

Of the 120 stories rated, there were 343 rated units of drive content. The raters agreed in 289 instances or 84.4 per cent of the time. When one considers

TABLE 3.--Inter-rater Agreement for Total Drive Content, Drive Level, and Drive Integration Ratings (N = 30)

Drive Ratings	Number Units ^a	Number Agreed ^b	Per Cent Agreed ^b
Total Drive Content	343	289*	84.4%
Direct-Unsocialized	65	60	92.3%
Direct-Socialized	110	105	95.4%
Disguised-Indirect	100	97	97.0%
Total for Levels	275	262	95.5%
<u>Thematic</u>	237	231	96.8%
<u>Incidental</u>	35	30	85.5%
<u>Nonappropriate</u>	3	2	66.6%
Total for Integration	275	263	95.7%

*Of the 289 agreements there were 14 unrated stories, i.e., both raters agreed that 14 stories had no ratable drive content present.

^aNumber of units where there was agreement on drive present initially.

^bBased on the degree to which rater II (JP) agreed with rater I (CD).

that agreement by chance alone would be near 0 per cent, the results seem more than adequate. The percentage of agreement for the various levels of drive expression and degrees of integration were also generally quite good. Agreement by chance alone would be 33 per cent in each category. Only the per cent of agreement for nonappropriate use of drive (66.6 per cent) falls below the 85 per cent mark.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).--The Counseling and Research (C & R) Form of the TSCS is a 100-item inventory of self descriptive statements designed to portray the individual's self concept and level of self esteem.* Such statements as "I like my looks just the way they are" (item 9), "I am as smart as I want to be" (item 44), "I get along well with other people" (item 87) are rated by S on a five point Likert scale, from "completely false" (+1) to "completely true" (+5). Half of the items in the Scale are negatively worded to control for response set (the tendency to agree or disagree regardless of item content). Ss responses are carbon copied through to a score sheet where response scale numbers for the negative items have been reversed. Thus high scores uniformly mean positive self description.

An additional feature of the Scale, which represents an improvement over earlier self concept inventories, is the inclusion of a "defensiveness" scale (SC scale). The SC scale is composed of 10 items taken from the L-scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and provides a measure of S's tendency to deliberately present a highly favorable, or unfavorable, picture of himself. As such, the SC score served as a validity index.

*See Appendix B for the TSCS test booklet and C&R answer packet.

The Total P Score is the single most important index of self-esteem on the Scale and was used for hypothesis testing. This score has a theoretical range from 100 to 500.

Test-retest reliability for the relevant scores ranges between .88 and .92 (Congdon, 1958; Fitts, 1965). Fitts also reports that "distinctive features of individual profiles are still present for most persons a year or more later" (Ibid., p. 15). Four types of validation procedures (i.e., (1) content validity, (2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlations with other personality measures, and (4) personality changes under particular conditions) tend to support the Scale as an accurate, valid measure of self-esteem. Content validity was achieved using seven independent judges. The final items used in the Scale were those for which perfect agreement on item content (item represents either a positive or negative self-evaluation) was achieved (Fitts, 1965).

Fitts demonstrated significant differences (mostly at the .001 level) between patients (N = 369) and non-patients (N = 626) for each of the scales used in the present study. He also reports that Congdon (1958), Havener (1961), and Wayne (1963) found similar patient vs. non-patient differences.

Fitts also reports that "most of the scores on the Scale correlate with MMPI scores in ways one would expect

from the nature of the scores" (1965, p. 24). Correlations with the Edwards Personal Preference Scale were quite low; however, a majority were in the expected direction.

Evidence for construct validity is also available from studies which assess changes in self-esteem during psychotherapy. Ashcraft & Fitts (1964) used an experimental group (N = 30) of patients who had been in therapy for an average of six months and a no-therapy control group (N = 24) who had been waiting for therapy for an average of 6.7 months. All subjects were measured on a test-retest basis with the Scale. Significant changes in predicted directions on 18 of the 22 variables were found for the therapy group. Of these, self-esteem (Total P score) was significantly higher for the therapy group while remaining unchanged for the control group.

Procedures

Both instruments were group administered during a single class period. Ss, upon entering the classroom, received a packet containing (1) a face sheet with the TAT instructions and six lined sheets for the stories and (2) a TSCS test booklet and C&R answer packet. All materials contained an identification number. Spontaneity was encouraged by omitting Ss name or student number. Only sex, age, and educational status were requested.

Following a review of the TAT standard instructions* by the experimenter (E), cards 1, 2, 4, and 13MF were projected individually on a wall screen for a period of five minutes (under semi-lighted conditions). TAT stories were written out by Ss. After each card there was a 15 second "time-out" when the wall screen was empty. This allowed for story completions and served as a cue that a new picture was forthcoming. After the final card was presented, additional time was given for story completions. All of the above procedures are in general accord with those cited in the related literature (Harrison, 1965).

The TSCS instructions (located on the inside cover of the test booklet) were then read aloud by E. Also at this time, Ss were instructed to write their age, sex, and educational status in the C&R answer packet. Following completion of the Scale, the test packets were collected by E. A brief question and answer period followed in which the rationale and goals of the project were discussed with the participating Ss.

*The TAT standard instructions are located in Appendix C.

RESULTS

General Findings

Table 4 lists the basic statistics for each of the relevant variables in the study.

TABLE 4.--Means and Standard Deviations for Major Variables
(N = 91)

Variable		Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Total P Score (level of self-esteem)	332.64	31.60
2.	TDC Score (total drive expression)	8.40	3.46
3.	D-S Score (socialized drive expression)	38.02	19.95
4.	D-U Score (unsocialized drive expression)	24.20	17.72
5.	D-I Score (disguised-indirect drive expression)	37.00	18.84
6.	Drive Integration Score	281.89	17.36
7.	SC Score (degree of defensiveness)	36.96	5.29

Following are the major hypotheses and pertinent data:

Hypothesis 1. There is a direct relationship between the total amount of drive expressed (as measured by the Total Drive Content (TDC) Score on the TAT protocols) and level of self-esteem (as measured by the Total P Score on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale).

TABLE 5.--The Relationship Between Total Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)

		Level of Self-esteem		
		Low	High	Totals
Total	High	17	28	45
Drive	Low	29	17	46
Content				
Totals		46	45	91
		$r_t = +.39^a$		df = 89

^a $p < .005$

Note: r_t (tetrachoric coefficient) was calculated by dichotomizing both variables at, or very near, the median according to the procedures outlined in Edwards, 1967, pp. 131-132.

As Table 5 indicates, level of self-esteem correlates moderately and in a positive direction with total drive expression. The correlation was significant at the .005 level or beyond. Thus Hypothesis 1 was confirmed.

Hypothesis 2. There is a direct relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in socially acceptable ways (as measured by the Direct-Socialized (D-S) Drive Content Score) and level of self-esteem.

As seen in Table 6, there is a small, positive correlation between level of self-esteem and amount of drive expressed in socially acceptable ways. The correlation was statistically significant at the .05 level and beyond. Hypothesis 2 was therefore confirmed.

TABLE 6.--The Relationship Between Socialized Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)

		Level of Self-esteem		
		Low	High	Totals
Socialized Drive Expression	High	19	26	45
	Low	25	21	46
	Totals	44	47	91
		$r_t = +.19^a$		df = 89

^ap < .05

Hypothesis 3. There is an inverse relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in unsocialized ways (as measured by the Direct-Unsocialized (D-U) Score) and the level of self-esteem

Table 7 reveals a moderate, negative correlation between level of self-esteem and amount of drive expressed in unsocialized ways. The correlation was statistically significant at the .005 level or beyond. Thus Hypothesis 3 was also confirmed.

TABLE 7.--The Relationship Between Unsocialized Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)

		Level of Self-esteem		
		Low	High	Totals
Unsocialized Drive Expression	High	27	20	47
	Low	17	27	44
	Totals	44	47	91
		$r_t = -.29^a$ $df = 89$		

$^a p < .005$

Hypothesis 4. There is an inverse relationship between the amount of drive which is expressed in highly constricted ways (as measured by the Disguised-Indirect (D-I) Score) and level of self-esteem.

As seen in Table 8, there is no relationship between level of self-esteem and amount of disguised-indirect drive expression. While the results are nonsignificant, there was a very slight trend in the hypothesized direction. Hypothesis 4 was, however, not confirmed by the data.

Hypothesis 5. There is a direct relationship between the degree of drive integration (as measured by the weighted proportion of thematic, incidental, and nonappropriate drive ratings) and level of self-esteem.

As Table 9 indicates, there is a moderate, correlation and in a positive direction between level of

TABLE 8.--The Relationship Between Highly Constricted Drive Expression and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)

		Level of Self-esteem		
		Low	High	Totals
Disguised-Indirect Drive Expression	High	23	22	45
	Low	22	24	46
	Totals	45	46	91
		$r_t = -.06^a$		df = 89

^aNot Significant

self-esteem and degree of drive integration. The correlation was statistically significant at the .005 level or beyond. Hypothesis 5 was therefore confirmed.

TABLE 9.--The Relationship Between Degree of Drive Integration and Level of Self-Esteem (N = 91)

		Level of Self-esteem		
		Low	High	Totals
Degree of Drive Integration	High	19	27	46
	Low	28	17	45
	Totals	47	44	91
		$r_t = +.32^a$		df = 89

^a $p < .005$

Sex Differences

In addition to the main hypotheses, there was an interest in the present study in exploring the relationship between sex of Ss and each of the major variables. Table 10 lists those results.

TABLE 10.--Differences in Level of Self-Esteem, Total Drive Content, Level of Drive Expression, and Degree of Drive Integration for Ss, by Sex

Variable	Male	Female	t	F
	<u>Ss</u> (N=47)	<u>Ss</u> (N=44)		
1. Total P Score (self-esteem)	X=336.79 sd=34.21	328.25 28.52	1.289*	1.445*
2. TDC Score (total drive)	8.55 3.84	8.23 3.04	0.447*	1.638*
3. D-S Score (socialized drive)	37.62 18.25	37.16 22.51	0.107*	1.531*
4. D-U Score (unsocialized drive)	23.53 17.44	24.04 18.17	0.370*	1.085*
5. D-I Score (constricted drive)	36.76 17.05	37.16 21.72	0.127*	1.620*
6. Degree of Drive Integration	280.04 19.18	283.86 15.16	1.049*	1.600*

*Not Significant (for nondirectional test).

As Table 10 indicates, there were no significant differences (in mean levels or variability) between male and female Ss on any of the major variables. However, there was a small trend toward male Ss exhibiting somewhat

higher self-esteem and expressing slightly more drive than female Ss.

Table 11 includes the correlation coefficients (r_t) for male and female Ss for each of the five major relationships studied, along with a test of significance for sex differences.

As seen in Table 11, there are several relationships which yield significant differences when sex of S is considered. Male and female Ss both displayed significant, positive correlations (+.36 and +.48 respectively) between level of self-esteem and total drive expression. While the correlation coefficients do not differ significantly it is apparent that for female Ss a greater proportion of the variance in self-esteem is attributable to total drive expression, and vice-versa.

Female Ss displayed a significant, positive correlation (+.41) between level of self-esteem and socialized drive expression whereas male Ss produced nonsignificant (and slightly inverse) results with a correlation of -.04. The differences in r_t were significant at the .02 level or beyond. The results indicate that the significant relationship for Hypothesis 2 was produced primarily by the inclusion of female Ss in the sample.

Female Ss also revealed a significantly higher negative correlation (-.54) between level of self-esteem and unsocialized drive expression than did male Ss who

TABLE 11.--The Relationship Between Level of Self-Esteem and Total Drive Expression, Level of Drive Expression, and Degree of Drive Integration for Ss, by Sex

Correlated Variables	Correlation Coefficients (r_t)		
	Male <u>Ss</u> (N = 47)	Female <u>Ss</u> (N = 44)	Z*
1. Level of self-esteem and total drive expression.	+.36 ^a	+.48 ^a	0.67**
2. Level of self-esteem and socialized drive expression.	-.04**	+.41 ^a	2.03 ^b
3. Level of self-esteem and unsocialized drive expression.	+.10**	-.54 ^a	3.24 ^c
4. Level of self-esteem and disguised-indirect drive.	-.04**	-.15**	0.51**
5. Level of self-esteem and degree of drive integration.	+.48 ^a	+.14**	1.75 ^d

*Z (Test of significance between two r for independent samples as outlined in Edwards, 1967, pp. 250-251.)

**Not Significant

^a $p < .01$ (nondirectional test)

^b $p < .02$ (" ")

^c $p < .0006$ (" ")

^d $p < .04$ (" ")

displayed a slightly positive correlation (+.10). Differences in r_t were significant at the .0006 level or beyond. This again indicates that female Ss contributed more to the significant results on Hypothesis 3 than did male Ss.

Neither male nor female Ss exhibited a significant correlation (-.04 and -.15 respectively) between self-esteem and disguised-indirect drive expression although the trends were in the hypothesized direction. In addition, the r_t values were not significantly different, indicating no sex differences on these variables.

Unlike the previous relationships, male Ss tended to have a significantly higher positive correlation (+.48) between self-esteem and drive integration than did female Ss (+.14). The differences in r_t were significant at the .04 level or beyond.

Defensiveness

It was of some interest to look at the ways in which defensiveness on the TSCS related to drive expression on the TAT productions. Table 12 lists the results for the SC scale (TSCS) both for the sample and by sex of S.

TABLE 12.--Degree of Defensiveness for Ss, by Sex (N = 91)

	Sample (N = 91)	Male <u>Ss</u> (N = 47)	Female <u>Ss</u> (N = 44)
Mean	36.96	36.53	37.41
Standard Deviation	5.29	5.02	5.43
t = 0.725*			
F = 1.180*			

*Not Significant (nondirectional test)

As Table 12 points out, male and female Ss did not differ significantly in the level of defensiveness displayed on the TSCS, although there was a very slight tendency for female Ss to be more open and free in their self-descriptions.

TABLE 13.--The Relationship Between Indices of Ego Control on the TAT and the Degree of Defensiveness on the Self-Concept Inventory

Correlated Variables	r_t	p
1. Total Drive Content (TDC) and Defensiveness (SC score).	-.19	$p < .10$
2. Degree of Drive Integration and Defensiveness.	.22	$p < .05$
3. Level of Direct-Socialized ratings and Defensiveness.	.12	NS*
4. Level of Direct-Unsocialized ratings and Defensiveness.	.01	NS*
5. Level of Disguised-Indirect ratings and Defensiveness.	.13	NS*

*Not Significant

Table 13 reveals a nonsignificant negative correlation between total drive content on the TAT and degree of defensiveness on the TSCS. Although nonsignificant ($r_t = -.19$, $.05 < p < .10$), there is a trend for Ss who project more drive content in the thematic productions to be less defensive on the TSCS. Conversely, SS who project

less thematic drive content tend to be more guarded on the self-concept inventory.

Table 13 also indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between the level of drive integration on the TAT and the degree of defensiveness on the TSCS. Nonsignificant correlations between drive socialization ratings and defensiveness were also evident from Table 13 (D-S ratings and defensiveness - $r_t = .13$; D-U ratings and defensiveness - $r_t = .01$; D-I ratings and defensiveness - $r_t = .13$).

DISCUSSION

Before proceeding with a discussion of the major findings, a few observations concerning the characteristics of the sample are in order. There were several independent indications that the sample represented a relatively adaptive group of college students (see Table 4). This was most clearly evident in the drive level scores which reflect the degree of drive modulation in the TAT fantasies. Ss, regardless of age, sex, or educational status, tended to express drive primarily in ego-syntonic, socialized ways; with a smaller proportion of highly-constricted, indirect drive expressions; and an even smaller proportion of ego-alien, unsocialized drive expressions. Secondly; the mean drive integration score was relatively high indicating that, as a group, Ss were able to integrate impulses in ways that were appropriate both stimuluswise and situationwise. Both of these findings reflect normal (ego) functioning and agree with results which Pine (1960) obtained with a similar sample of college students.

On the TSCS, Ss obtained a mean self-esteem score which was significantly lower ($t = 2.54, p < .05$) than

Fitt's normative group (TSCS Manual, 1965, p. 14). Several factors likely account for this difference. One, the present group was somewhat different than Fitt's normative group on such demographic variables as age and educational status. Ss in the present study were primarily between the ages of 19 and 21 whereas Fitts reports an age range from 12 to 68. In addition, Ss in the present study were all college students (primarily upper-level undergraduates) while Fitt's group included educational levels from 6th grade through the Ph.D. degree. Secondly; the lower self-esteem scores in the present study may reflect cultural changes which have occurred since 1965.

The mean "defensiveness" score on the TSCS did not differ significantly from that reported in the Manual and lends further support to the notions of an adaptive sample. These findings seem to allow the conclusion that the sample represented a group of relatively well-adjusted, adaptive college students who were primarily between the ages of 19 and 21 years. It is necessary then in the discussion which follows to restrict the conclusions and interpretations to this particular portion of the population.

The major findings tended, in general, to support the previously-stated predictions. As Tables 5-9 indicate, Ss with positive self-esteem displayed more aggressive and sexual drive derivatives in their TAT fantasies than did Ss with low self-esteem. In addition, high

self-esteem Ss revealed higher levels of drive socialization and higher levels of drive integration. In contrast, Ss with low self-esteem tended to project less sexual and aggressive content in their TAT fantasies. When drives were expressed, they appeared more frequently in blatant, unsocialized ways. In addition, these individuals revealed a tendency toward poorly-integrated drive expression.

These findings lend considerable support to Schafer's (1958) views that the concept of "regression in the service of the ego" can be used to account for level of ego functioning on projective tests. In line with these views, the present results indicate that individuals with positive self-esteem tend to produce TAT stories which reflect considerable "regression in the service of the ego": stories reveal higher levels of drive expression combined with an appropriate level of ego control which is reflected in the degree to which drive material is integrated into the thematic product and in the degree to which it is altered from more primitive, blatant forms. The present results also indicate that individuals who possess low self-esteem tend to reveal less "regression in the service of the ego" on the TAT: stories reveal that higher levels of control are maintained with a suppression of drives. These stories reflect a guardedness which results in mere card description with little or no direct

drive expression. When drives do appear, they are more likely to be projected in blatantly unsocialized, poorly-integrated ways.

Hypothesis 4 was not confirmed by the data. It was predicted that low self-esteem individuals would display higher levels of disguised-indirect (D-I) drive expressions. This prediction was made on the assumption that individuals with low self-esteem would be less able, and willing, to regress adaptively and would therefore maintain higher levels of control. Consequently drives, if expressed, would appear in a highly-derived, disguised form. However, as Table 8 indicates, there was no relationship between level of self-esteem and D-I ratings. In attempting to explain this finding the author went back into the TAT protocols and re-examined the D-I ratings. It became obvious that a majority of these ratings were derived from the character labels (husband, wife, boyfriend, girlfriend, policeman, and such) which were used in developing the thematic productions. While there was considerable variability in the D-I scores, it appears as though the variations were related more to the extent that these labels were used in developing the written themes than to the personality variable under consideration. Individuals who obtained higher D-I ratings used labels like "husband and wife" to develop their themes rather than just writing about "two people" or "this person and

that person." None of the other scoring categories included ratings which are so directly germane to the test task itself (i.e., developing the written theme).

The present study represents, what appears to be, an initial attempt to demonstrate that the level of ego functioning on the TAT is an understandable and predictable phenomenon. The levels of drive expression and drive control evident in the thematic productions reflected, in significant ways, the trends predicted by the "adaptive regression" hypothesis. The concept of "adaptive regression" appears then to represent (at least for a normal population) a viable hypothesis from which to understand and assess the nature of ego control operations in the projective process. Additional studies attempting to examine the question of "how does the individual respond" (process) rather than "what does he say" (content) are needed to develop an adequate process theory of the TAT. In so doing, valuable contributions to an increased understanding of the structural aspects of personality will also be made.

It is evident from the modest size of the obtained correlations that level of self-esteem is certainly not the only determinant of ego functioning. The variations in level of self-esteem account for only a small portion of the variance in level of ego functioning, and vice versa.

In addition to the main findings, there was an interest in studying sex differences on the major variables. While a number of studies have examined the relationship between level of self-esteem and sex of subject (McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Fitts, 1965), there has been an almost complete absence of reported data on sex differences and TAT fantasy behavior. This is due primarily to the fact that most studies have used only males (Eron, 1950; Purcell, 1965; Lindzey & Tezessy, 1965). Where both males and females have been included (Pine, 195; Perkins, 1965), sex differences have not been reported. The present data was analyzed for sex differences primarily to fill this apparant void.

As Table 10 indicates, there was no significant difference between male and female Ss for level of self-esteem. These results agree with those reported by Fitts (1965) and disagree with McKee and Sherriffs' (1959) findings that males display significantly higher self-esteem than females. While the differences were not significant, it will be noted that the trend, in the present data, was in the direction of McKee and Sherriffs' findings.

Male and female Ss did not differ significantly in their TAT fantasy behavior, either in terms of the total amount of projected drive content or in the degree of ego control (levels of drive socialization and drive

integration). While there are reasons to expect that males would project more aggressive drive content than females (i.e., cultural expectations), it does not appear that they differ when sexual and aggressive drives are assessed collectively (the two types of instinctual drives were not evaluated separately in the present study).

In examining sex differences for the five major predictions, several interesting findings emerged. Female Ss tended to display, in a rather impressive fashion, the trends between self-esteem and ego functioning which have already been discussed. Of particular import, were the sizable correlations between level of self-esteem and total drive content ($r_t = .48, p < .01$); level of self-esteem and direct-socialized drive content ($r_t = .41, p < .01$); and level of self-esteem and direct-unsocialized drive content ($r_t = -.54, p < .01$).

For male Ss, an interesting reversal occurred. Although males displayed significant correlations between level of self-esteem and total drive content ($r_t = .36$) and between level of self-esteem and degree of drive integration ($r_t = .48$), the relationships between level of self-esteem and drive socialization (D-S and D-U ratings) were in the opposite directions of the original hypotheses. What this seemed to suggest was that positive self-esteem males who also revealed adequate ego functioning on the TAT in terms of the drive integration ratings, were at the

same time revealing lower levels of drive socialization; a theoretical contradiction. In a post hoc fashion, the protocols for the high D-U male Ss were re-examined in an attempt to explain these unexpected findings. The examination revealed that these Ss could be divided into two fairly distinct groups based on the qualitatively different D-U stories. Eight (8) of these males produced stories where impulses were obviously expressed in anti-social ways. For these Ss, sexual and aggressive impulses were mixed together and confused with stories like "rape followed by murder," "a beating and then intercourse," and other highly deviant expressions. These stories seemed to clearly indicate unsocialized, value-violating drive expressions.

However, a majority of the high D-U males (N = 16) produced stories, which, if the Manual had been modified to fit the current male college norms, would have been rated direct-socialized rather than direct-unsocialized. Included among these stories were such themes as "going to bed with a girlfriend," "having intercourse with a date," "a Senator taking a mistress to bed," and such. These stories should have likely received D-S ratings in light of the changing standards on sexual behavior. It is interesting to note that none of these "healthier" stories included an admixture of aggressive impulses. When these stories were re-rated, significant correlations

(in the predicted directions) between level of self-esteem and drive socialization were obtained. It is important to remember however, that this was a post hoc analysis and that no independent rater was used. These findings do, however, tend to emphasize several obvious but important points. One, what is ego-syntonic and what is ego-alien may be culture-and time-specific. It is important therefore to consider not only the norms of the particular subculture with which the individual identifies but also the extent to which these norms change with time. Secondly; these findings point out the limitations of the scoring procedure itself. It is apparent that the Manual, while it represents an improvement over earlier methods, was unable to assess finer nuances in ego-syntonicity and levels of socialization.

It is interesting to note that the adaptive female Ss adhered to more "conservative" ways of expressing sexual impulses than the male Ss. Whether this means that females entertain somewhat different fantasies than males or whether they were merely more reluctant to admit to the same fantasies is a matter for additional speculation.

It will be recalled from an earlier section, that considerable disagreement exists between those who believe that projective and non-projective tests elicit qualitatively different information about personality (Abt, 1950; Murray, 1965) and those who purport that both instruments

produce similar material (Allport, 1953). The basic issue, as it was discussed, concerns the extent to which individuals control and censor their responses on each type of test. Since the TSCS includes a "defensiveness" scale it was convenient to compare the amount of guardedness or censorship on this paper-and-pencil test to the level of control imposed on the TAT fantasies. Scores from the defensiveness scale were correlated with the TDC scores, drive integration ratings, D-S, D-U, and D-I ratings.

As Table 13 indicates, there is a negative correlation ($r_t = -.19$, $p < .10$) between the total amount of thematic drive content (TDC) and degree of defensiveness on the self-concept inventory. If we assume an inverse relationship between level of projected drive and level of ego control, then the data suggests that Ss who maintain higher levels of ego control over impulse expression on the TAT also exert more control (censorship) over their responses on the paper-and-pencil test.

Table 13 also reveals a significant positive correlation ($r_t = .22$, $p < .05$) between the degree of thematic drive integration and degree of defensiveness. In an earlier discussion, the level of drive integration was assumed to represent the extent to which the ego was able to regulate impulses in task-appropriate ways. Thus, higher levels of drive integration represent a greater degree of ego control over impulse expression whereas

lower drive integration ratings suggest poorer ego control. The positive correlation then suggests that Ss who display more active ego-regulation of drives in the thematic product also exert more control over their response on the paper-and-pencil test. These findings are in general agreement with Allport's (1965) assumptions that Ss who are more defensive and guarded, are able to control what they say or do on either type of test.

It should also be pointed out that the present study represents one of the few reported times when various scores on a projective technique have been found to be related, in significant ways, to scores on a paper-and-pencil test.

This discussion should not be concluded without mentioning briefly an additional interpretation for the current findings. Thus far, the results have been interpreted in terms of the "adaptive regression" hypothesis, with a focus on the projective process itself. If we can assume that fantasy behavior is directly related to overt behavior, then the results can be explained in terms of social learning theory as well (Bandura & Walters, 1967). Individuals who learn to express sexual and aggressive impulses in socially-acceptable ways should receive the sorts of positive feedback which would lead to positive self-evaluations. Conversely, individuals who display anti-social or asocial sexual and aggressive behavior

should incur negative reinforcement from others which would lead to negative self-evaluations. The nature of the self-evaluations (either positive or negative) should, in turn, tend to sustain (reinforce) the different modes of impulse expression. While these two interpretations are by no means contradictory, they do shift the level of analysis from the projective test itself to everyday overt behavior.

Research studies, to date, have failed to clarify the nature of the relationship between fantasy behavior and overt behavior. Studies by Purcell (1965), Perkins (1965), and Pittluck (1968) have demonstrated a direct relationship while other studies (Back, 1954; Korner, 1949) have found an inverse relationship. This lack of agreement combined with the fact that the present study did not include a measure of overt behavior, suggests that the present results and interpretations should be restricted to fantasy behavior on the TAT.

Future Research Considerations

Predicting overt behavior from TAT fantasy behavior has met with many successes and failures. As was cited previously, overt behavior has been found to be both directly and inversely related to TAT fantasy behavior. Part of the reason for these inconsistent results seems to stem from the rather broad, poorly differentiated scoring procedures which have been utilized. In predicting aggressive behavior, Purcell (1965) rated such divergent TAT

expressions as "criminal assault" and "mention of illness" in the same scoring category. It would seem necessary in attempting to predict anti-social or asocial expressions of sexuality or aggression, that the scoring categories be refined sufficiently so as to differentiate between impulse expressions which are commensurate with social norms and those which are value-violating. The studies, to date, tend only to reveal the extent to which impulses are an issue for the person rather than how the impulses will be expressed. Obviously, the important question from a diagnostic or prognostic viewpoint is not "how aggressive does the person feel" but "how will this individual express his hostility"? (Or sexuality as the case may be.) The Pine Scoring Manual provides a means by which such distinctions can be assessed and evaluated. Although Berg (1963) and Perkins (1965) offer some evidence which would validate these suggestions, additional research is needed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Various research studies have failed to support earlier assumptions that underlying drives are directly expressed in TAT fantasy behavior. The evidence points rather to the operation of certain mediating processes which intervene between the impulse and its overt manifestations.

The present study was designed to examine the level of drive mediation in TAT productions and to study the relationship between these mediational processes and the individual's level of self-esteem. The concept of "regression in the service of the ego" was utilized to make predictions concerning the level of drive expression, drive integration, and drive modulation in the thematic productions and their relationship to level of self-esteem.

Ninety-one subjects (Ss) wrote stories to selected TAT cards and responded to a self-concept inventory. TAT protocols were rated for: (1) total amount of projected sexual and aggressive drive content, (2) degree of drive integration, and (3) degree of drive socialization. Tetrachoric correlational coefficients between the

thematic drive ratings and the self-concept inventory scores were computed.

The major findings were as follows:

(1) Individuals with high self-esteem produce TAT stories with higher levels of sexual and aggressive drive content. High self-esteem Ss also display higher levels of drive integration and drive socialization in their thematic productions.

(2) Individuals with low self-esteem produce TAT stories with lower levels of sexual and aggressive drive content. These low self-esteem Ss tend also to either (a) produce highly descriptive, banal stories with little direct drive expression, or (b) develop stories with higher levels of poorly-integrated, blatantly-unsocialized drive expression.

These findings were interpreted as supporting the assumptions surrounding the role of "regression in the service of the ego" in the projective process. The implications of using this concept as a basis for a "process theory" of the TAT were discussed.

(3) Male and female Ss did not differ significantly in the level of drive expression or drive control on the TAT. In addition, there were no sex differences in level of self-esteem. Female Ss followed the major trends between thematic behavior and self-esteem as reported above. Male Ss, however, obtained correlations

between self-esteem scores and drive socialization ratings which were not in the hypothesized directions. A post hoc analysis suggested that "adaptive" males projected more drive with slightly lower levels of socialization which, because of the limitations of the scoring procedure, were rated as unsocialized rather than socialized drive content. When these drive content ratings were re-rated as socialized, significant correlations in the hypothesized directions were obtained.

(4) Several measures of ego control on the TAT were found to be related to the degree of defensiveness on the self-concept inventory. Level of thematic drive integration was directly related to defensiveness ($r_t = .22, p < .05$), whereas amount of total drive content was inversely related to defensiveness ($r_t = -.19, p < .10$). Level of drive socialization was not significantly related to defensiveness although the trend was in the expected direction ($r_t = .12$). These findings were discussed as supporting Allport's (1965) views that Ss are able to impose similar levels of control on projective and non-projective tests.

It was also pointed out that the present findings represent one of the few reported studies where scores on a projective technique were found to be related, in significant ways, to scores on a paper-and-pencil test.

Future research was considered with an emphasis on utilizing the Pine Drive Content Manual in a study relating fantasy behavior to overt behavior.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abt, L. E. A theory of projective psychology. In L. E. Abt & L. Bellak (Eds.) Projective psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1950. Pp. 33-68.
- Allport, G. W. The trend in motivational theory. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965. Pp. 35-48.
- Ashcraft, C. & Fitts, W. H. Self-concept change in psychotherapy. Psychotherapy, 1964, 1, 115-118.
- Atkinson, J. & McClelland, D. The projective expression of needs: II. The effect of different intensities of the hunger drive on thematic apperception. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1948, 38, 643-658.
- Bach, G. Young children's play fantasies. Psychological monographs, 1945, 59 (No. 2).
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- Berg, P. S. D. Neurotic and psychopathic criminals: Some measures of ego syntonicity, impulse socialization, and perceptual consistency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Clark, R. The projective measurement of experimentally induced levels of sexual motivation. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1952, 44, 391-399.
- Cohen, I. Adaptive regression, dogmatism, and creativity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Congden, S. Self theory and chlorpromazine treatment. In W. H. Fitts, Manual for Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recording and Tests, 1965. Pp. 28-29.

- Davids, A. Comparison of three methods of personality assessment: Direct, indirect, and projective. Journal of Personality, 1955, 23, 423-440.
- Diggory, J. Self-evaluation: Concepts and studies. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- Edwards, A. Statistical methods. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- Erickson, E. Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1968.
- Eron, L. A normative study of the TAT. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965. Pp. 469-507.
- Feshbach, S. The drive reducing function of fantasy behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 3-11.
- Fitts, W. Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Frank, L. Projective methods. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1948.
- Freud, S. The ego and the Id. (1923) New York: W. W. Norton, 1960.
- Freud, S. On narcissism: An introduction. In Collected Papers. London: Hogarth, 1924, 4, 30-59. (trans.)
- Freud, S. The problem of anxiety. (Trans. H. A. Bunker from Hemming, Symptom, and Angst, 1926.) New York: W. W. Norton, 1936.
- Gordon, H. A comparative study of dreams and responses to the TAT. A need-press analysis. Journal of Personality, 1953, 22, 234-253.
- Harrison, R. Thematic apperception methods. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of clinical psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Hartmann, H. Ego psychology and the problems of adaptation. New York: International University Press, 1958.
- Havener, P. Distortions in the perception of self and others by persons using paranoid defenses. In W. Fitts Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recording and Tests, 1965. Pp. 28.

- Hersch, J. Cognitive functioning of the creative person. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1962, 26, 193-199.
- Holt, R. Forman aspects of the TAT. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1958, 22, 163-172.
- Korner, A. Some aspects of hostility in young children. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1949.
- Kris, E. Psychoanalytic explorations in art. New York: International Universities Press, 1952.
- Lazarus, R. A substitutive defensive conception of apperceptive fantasy. In J. Kagan & G. Lesser (Eds.) Contemporary issues in thematic apperceptive methods. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961. Pp. 51-71.
- Lindzey, G. The assessment of human motives. In G. Lindzey (Ed.) The assessment of human motives. New York: Rinehart, 1958. Pp. 3-32.
- Lindzey, G. & Tezessy C. Thematic apperception test: Indices of aggression in relation to measure of overt and covert behavior. In B. Murstein (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965. Pp. 575-586.
- McClelland, D., Atkinson, J., Clark, R., & Lowell, E. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton, 1953.
- Murray, H. Manual for the Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge: Harvard Universities Press, 1943.
- Murray, H. Uses of the Thematic Apperception Test. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965. Pp. 425-432.
- Murstein, B. (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Pine, F. Thematic drive content and creativity. Journal of Personality, 1959, 27, 136-151.
- Pine, F. A manual for rating drive content in the TAT. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1960, 24, 32-45.

- Perkins, R. Repression, psychopathology, and drive representation: An experimental hypnotic investigation of the management of impulse inhibition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Pittluch, P. The relation between aggressive fantasy and overt behavior. In A. I. Rabin (Ed.) Projective techniques and personality assessment. New York: Springer, 1968. Pp. 213.
- Powell, M. Self-concept-vs-creativity. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25 (3), 2054.
- Purcell, K. The thematic apperception test and antisocial behavior. In B. Murstein (Ed.) Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books, 1965. Pp. 575-586.
- Rogers, C. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogolsky, M. Artistic creativity and adaptive regression in 3rd grade children. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1968, 32, 53.
- Schafer, R. Regression in the service of the ego: The relevance of a psychoanalytic concept for personality assessment. In G. Lindzey (Ed.) The assessment of human motives. New York: Rinehart, 1958. Pp. 119-148.
- Scodel, A., & Lipetz, M. TAT hostility and psychopathology. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1957, 21, 161-165.
- Sisk, D. Self-concept and creative thinking. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27(8-A), 2455.
- Smith, M. The phenomenological approach in personality theory: Some critical remarks. In E. Southwell & M. Merbaum (Eds.) Personality: Theory and research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1964. Pp. 230-241.
- Sullivan, H. S. Conceptions of modern psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton, 1945.
- Symonds, P. The ego and the self. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1951.

- Taylor, C., & Combs, A. Self-acceptance and adjustment. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 89-91.
- Walker, E., Atkinson, J., Veroff, J., Birney, R., Dember, W., & Moulton, R. The expression of fear-related motivation in thematic apperception as a function of proximity to an atomic explosion. In J. Atkinson (Ed.) Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1958. Pp. 143-159.
- Wayne, S. The relation of self-esteem to indices of perceived and behavioral hostility. In W. Fitts Manual for Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recording & Tests, 1965. Pp. 28.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A MANUAL FOR RATING DRIVE CONTENT IN THE THEMATIC APPERCEPTION TEST

APPENDIX A

A Manual for Rating Drive Content in the Thematic Apperception Test*

Fred Pine

The Scoring Manual

Presence of drive content

Throughout the manual, the term "drive" is used in the psychoanalytic sense to refer to instinctual drives and their derivatives. This includes aggressive and libidinal drives and partial drives (oral, anal, phallic, genital, exhibitionistic, voyeuristic, sadistic, masochistic, homosexual, narcissistic) (cf., Freud, 1905). The term "drive content" refers to observable ideational derivatives of the inferred aggressive and libidinal drives. These derivatives appear in the TAT story content.

Drive content is rated only if it is stated explicitly in the story; thus, for example, implied motives and symbolic expressions of drives are not rated. The decision to rate only the manifest story content was made for two reasons: first, in the belief that individual differences would be erased somewhat in speculations about more universally present drives which are latent (in the story) and unconscious (in the person); second, in an attempt to relate the ratings closely to the psychology of ego functioning. The manual is not intended to be an all-purpose one; both its usefulness and its limitations are tied to its commitments to psychoanalytic theory (reflected here in the selection of aggressive and libidinal drives for rating) and its more specific commitment to psychoanalytic ego psychology (reflected here in the emphasis on control operations with regard to expressed drive content).

Drive content is rated if it appears at any point in S's response to a TAT card except in response to a direct inquiry question. Thus, "how did he feel?" - "angry" would not be rated although responses to inquiries such as "tell me more" or "how did it all turn out" are rated. Drive content is rated without regard to its extent; passing mention or full thematic development of, say, an aggressive incident would each be rated. On the

* Journal of Projective Techniques, 1960, 24, 32-45.

other hand, drive content which is too far removed from aggressive or libidinal connections is not rated (for example, friendship, achievement motives, gazing at scenery); it was found necessary to establish some such cutting point, albeit an arbitrary one, in order to avoid a tendency to rate almost everything S says. The ratings of drive level, described below, represent an attempt to cope with this entire issue. Finally, affective experiences which are directly linked to particular drives (anger, love) are rated, although affective states in general are not (shame, guilt, sadness, elation, etc.). These and all other ratings are illustrated below.

Integration of drive content

S's task on the TAT is to tell a story about a picture. To the degree that drive content is given in accord with this task requirement, some ego control is indicated. The degree to which drive content is integrated into S's response to a card (the response ordinarily being a story, but on occasion an essay-like production or an elaborated description) was taken to be an index of appropriateness of drive expression and adequacy of ego control.

Of the appropriately used drive content, two types were distinguished. Drive content which is part of the central theme or character portrayal of the story is rated thematic, in contrast to drive content which is incidental to the main theme (but still part of the story). Drive content can be rated thematic even if it is given only briefly; its links to the main story rather than its extent is at issue here. Even if the rater feels a story could get along without an item of drive content, if S gave it as part of the central story theme it is rated thematic. Incidental drive content, while integrated into the story, is generally expendable even in S's presentation of the material. For example, drive content is generally incidental when it is given in analogy which is intended tangentially to enrich the story.

In contrast to both thematic and incidental ratings, a rating of nonappropriate is given to those expressions of drive which are not in accord with the TAT task (telling a story about a picture) or which were not intended by S. These include: 1. Exclamations and side comments before, during, or after the story (for example, "Wow, this is a sexy one" or "That murder last week gives me an idea for this story"). 2. Drive content given in card descriptions when it does not then get included in the

story (for example, mention of the gun on card 3BM followed by a story about fatigue rather than, say, suicide).

3. Misperceptions or doubts about the identity of persons or objects when drive content is involved (for example, calling the violin on card 1 a machine gun or misperceiving the sex of a character; the figure on 3BM and the lower figure on 18GF were unrated whether seen as male or female).

4. Verbal slips where drive content is evident in the slip itself (including the sexual ambiguity suggested by use of wrong-sex pronouns- "he" instead of "she" for example). Slips that are made in a broader drive content context are rated separately while the story context gets its own rating.

Directness of expression of drive content.

TAT stories vary in the degree to which their expressed drive content is primitive, value-violating, and direct on the one hand, or socialized, value-syntonic, and/or disguised on the other. The present manual distinguishes three levels of expression of drive content, the levels partially modelled after Holt and Havel's (1959) distinction between two levels of drive content in Rorschach responses.

Level I (direct-unsocialized) includes those expressions of drive content where libidinal or aggressive impulses are directly expressed in a way contrary to conventional social values. Murder, robbery, rape, prostitution, homosexuality, alcoholism, and extramarital sexual relationships, for example, are all rated here. In addition to the criterion "violation of conventional values," a second criterion is applied for aggression derivatives, i.e., physical expression. Anger is rated level I only when it involves physical violence. In all cases, it is only the unsocialized and direct drive expression in the manifest story content which gets rated.

Level II (direct-socialized) includes those expressions of drive content where libidinal or aggressive impulses are expressed directly but in socialized ways. Anger expressed without physical violence, arguments among family members, sexual rivalries and jealousies, kissing, eating, social drinking, intercourse between marriage partners, and childbirth are all rated here.

Level III (indirect-disguised; weak) actually includes two kinds of drive content. The first, indirect and

disguised drive expression, includes those instances that are associated with (often relatively strong) drives, but where the underlying impulse is neither explicitly thought nor acted upon in the story. Mention of police, soldiers, rulers, restaurants, saloons, illness, accidents, natural or accidental deaths are all included here. All of these permit the inference that a particular drive is an issue for the person but, although some reflection of the drive appears in the manifest story, the drive itself is not expressed. If the context alters this, e.g., "he ate in a restaurant" or "the soldier fought," level II or I would be rated. The second type of content rated level III includes drive expressions which are weak and highly derived. For example, social expressions of aggression derivatives such as strikes and militant unions are rated here as are highly formalized drive expressions such as familial affection. An arbitrary cutoff point must be established here so that material which is too weak does not get rated. Reference to surgeons, microscopes, struggles to get ahead in life are not rated although inferences can readily be made to impulses from which they derive.

Three additional points on drive level ratings:

- (1) Negation of drive expression is rated identically with positive expression. "He wanted to kiss her but he didn't" is rated level II. (Such negated expressions are often given in such a manner as to make them "incidental"; for example, "let's see...it's not that he wanted to kiss her, I'd say he just liked her.")
- (2) Thoughts and wishes are rated equally with actions in most cases. "He wanted to kill him" is rated level I whether or not the act is carried out. On occasion, such content is given as a way of communicating intensity rather than true intent; in those instances a more controlled level may be rated.
- (3) Context is always considered in rating drive level. For example, kissing as part of an attempted seduction of a married person is level I rather than II. Similarly, criminal execution and war are the two major examples of killing that may be rated level II rather than level I; for war stories, the level II rating is given when the emphasis is on patriotism, duty, and the normal course of events in war rather than on aggressive acts and violations of rules of warfare.

Units of analysis

Drive material may be rated many times in any one story, and considerations of the extent of the expressed

content were independent of the rating unit. Several rules were established to guide raters in selecting the unit to be rated in each instance: (1) Expressions of derivatives of different drives are rated as separate instances of drive expression. For example, "he was angry but a couple of drinks helped him to settle down" would be rated once for the aggressive content and once for the oral content. (2) Expressions of drive with differing degrees of integration into the story (thematic, incidental, or nonappropriate) are always rated separately, even if the drive expressed is identical. Thus, an incidental and a thematic aggressive phrase would receive two ratings. (3) In contrast, a new level of an already expressed drive would not get a separate rating. "He went into a bar (level III) and got dead drunk" (level I) would be rated only once, the rating of the more extreme content. This stepwise expression of drive material appears so often and generally with such an inevitability in the sequence that to rate them independently would artificially raise the total number of ratings given. (4) Within the same general type of drive content and the same degree of integration separate ratings are given if new behavior sequences are described or if the expressed impulse has a new aim.

Some illustrative stories and ratings

Four illustrative TAT stories are given below. Stories particularly rich in rating issues were selected. In each, certain material is lettered and italicized; comments on the lettered material are given immediately following each story, using the letters for cross reference. Ratings are given in parentheses. The first symbol indicates the drive level (I, II, or III); the second symbol indicates the degree of integration ("T" for thematic, "In" for incidental, and "N" for nonappropriate).

1. (Card 3BM) (a) Well, I take it that is a pistol on the floor. This young man is in a Balkan country. He was young and (b) inclined to melancholy. (c) The Germans had overrun the country. His father had been captured and killed by the Germans. His fortune was lost and all his friends died. Oh, I forgot to say he was Jewish. He's been making feverish attempts (d) to release his father, but without success. Now he has returned from an exploit where he went to German headquarters, (e) shot the man who was there, and ran through the streets to his home. He knows what will happen when he's caught, so he (f) puts a bullet through his own head. (g) I guess that's

a pistol. It certainly isn't a very realistic representation of one though.

a. (Not rated) Although this is card description, it is later used in the story. Had the gun been mentioned and then omitted from the story it would have been rated III-N (level III because it is associated with an aggressive impulse which, however, would not have been expressed in the story). As is, the rating is included with (f), below.

b. (Not rated) Affects are rated only if drive content is specifically stated.

c. (I-T) All of this is rated as one unit. The emphasis on the atrocities of war requires the level I rating. It is all central to the story theme.

d. (I-N) The phrase "release his father" contradicts the earlier "his father had been captured and killed." There is a slip here somewhere, and since it involves the killing of the father, it is rated level I, nonappropriate.

e. (I-T) Though still aggression, this is a new behavior sequence (in relation to the actions of the German invaders) and is rated separately. Although one may sympathize with the actions of the hero, the murder in a revenge context is best rated as level I.

f. (I-T) This aggression too is sufficiently different from the former instances to be rated separately. Suicide is level I. Although the suicide is only briefly mentioned, it is still part of the central theme of the story and is rated thematic.

g. (I-N) This is a nonappropriate extraneous comment; it has nothing to do with the story. Since context is considered in rating drive level, and since the gun has already been established in the story as a murder and suicide weapon, the reference to the gun here is level I rather than level III.

2. (Card 10) (a) A soldier going off to fight in the war, and the woman with whom he is supposedly (b) in love is crying and kisses him goodbye. Much later, he returns to France and finds that his young lady has (c) married someone else in order to keep herself in (d) food and clothing. And he does nothing probably. Looks for (e) food and clothing for himself. No action. Well, of course the marriage- I could clear that. He could find her, and she, not having married for love, (f) could give herself to him as well as to the person she married.

a. (II-T) In the context of duty, war is rated level II.

b. (II-T) This is a direct expression of a libidinal impulse in a socialized way and in line with the main story theme.

c. (III-T) The later references to marriage in the story add nothing new to this first reference and are included in this rating. Marriage, when given in such a stylized way, is rated level III since only a very watered down expression of drive comes through into the story.

d. (II-T) Oral (food) content is different from the earlier rated libidinal content (kissing and marriage) and is rated as a separate unit. The reference to food provides motivation for the marriage under wartime conditions and, as such, is essential to the main theme of the given story. It is a direct expression of an oral need.

e. (II-In) Once again the reference to food is a direct oral expression in a socialized way. Here, however, it seems to be presented by S as a momentary pause in the story, before S gets on with the main theme; as such it is rated incidental. Incidental presentation by S in the story, rather than the rater's decision that a story could do without an item of drive content, is what requires an item of drive content to be rated incidental. Although the "food" content here is identical with the previously rated item, it is rated as a separate unit because it is a different degree of integration (incidental rather than thematic) and because it is a new behavior sequence carried out by another person; either of these reasons alone would be sufficient to require a separate rating for this unit.

f. (I-T) Using the conventional values of society as the yardstick for deciding between level I and level II ratings, this is unsocialized drive expression and is rated level I.

3. (Card 13MF) This boy had (a) time to kill and stopped in a (b) bar for a few drinks. He kept (c) noticing a girl who was not pretty but whose dress showed off her body well. She came up to him after a while and suggested they go to her apartment. She was (d) not what might be considered an actual prostitute but she was lonely and wanted to do something to change her mood. After they had (e) three or four drinks at her place, she suddenly suggested (f) they go to bed together. The boy was naive and was taken aback, but felt his (g) manly pride required him to do so- so he did. As he's leaving the room now, he feels that sexual relations

are not all that they are made out to be and that he can take it or leave it. But what he doesn't realize is that (h) sex should never be an end in itself but only a means to an end with someone you love.

a. (Not rated) Figurative expressions like this one are not rated.

b. (II-T) This is an instance where two similar instances of drive content are rated as one unit even though they would individually be rated at different levels (bar as level III and drinks as level II). The two form a consistent unit and are rated at the level of the strongest expression.

c. (II-T) Although "noticing" alone would be considered too distant from voyeuristic impulses to be rated, the total context provides a ratable voyeuristic-exhibitionistic theme. The expression is direct, socialized, and thematic.

d. (I-In) The denial here makes this incidental to the main theme. Although prostitution is negated, it is still level I.

e. (II-T) This is a new behavior sequence and is rated separately from the earlier oral content. The drinking here is still sufficiently socialized to get a level II rating.

f. (I-T) This rating includes the various references to intercourse in the story. Premarital intercourse, certainly in this non-love context, is rated level I.

g. (III-T) This is a thematic and highly derived expression of narcissistic libido.

h. (II-In) This is extraneous comment, but it manages to retain enough of a link to the story (as a "moral" of sorts) so that it cannot be rated nonappropriate. Hence, the incidental rating.

4. (Card 4) (a) These people resemble Clark Gable and Gene Tierney. The curtains give the impression this takes place in a house, but (b) the pin-up picture in the back seems to negate this. So I conclude that it's (c) in a bar or a roadside stand or someplace like that, and (d) this waitress is trying to prevent this truck driver from leaving. He's (e) not too well liked by the other drivers on the route, so one of them started a rumor that his (f) girlfriend here was cheating on him. The eyes of the girl make it clear that she'll convince him of the falseness of the rumors. (How does he feel?) He has a tinge of doubt, but he believes (g) him...her... basically, but he has doubt. The doubt makes him have a not very convincing (h) fit of anger but then they forget

it.

a. (Not rated) Although this is relevant commentary, it has no drive content and is not rated.

b. (II-In) This is card description which gets into the story only peripherally, through providing a kind of atmosphere and backdrop; as such it is incidental. The voyeuristic implications of the pin-up picture seem direct enough to require a level II rating.

c. (III-In) All of this oral content is level III; no one is actually eating. Although this is part of the story, the way in which S presents it ("it could be X or Y or Z") indicates that it is incidental even to S himself.

d. (III-T) "Waitress" is rated separately from "bar or restaurant" since it is given as part of the main story theme and is thus a new level of integration.

e. (II-T) The rating is level II. In spite of the euphemistic and negative mode of expression, this is still a direct expression of hostility.

f. (II-T) Applying conventional standards of morality: since the first man and the woman are unmarried, and since intercourse is not explicit here, the reference to "cheating" seems better described as level II than level I.

g. (III-N) This slip, involving a sexual confusion, gets rated although a slip in which the drive content is not evident in the slip itself would not be rated. The him-her ambiguity does not involve any direct drive expression and is rated level III.

h. (II-T) Although this is part of the inquiry, it is rated because it was not evoked directly by an inquiry question. (If the sequence had been, "how does he feel?," "angry," there would be no rating.) No physical violence is made explicit in the story, so the "fit of anger" remains level II.

APPENDIX B

THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

TEST BOOKLET

APPENDIX B

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale Test Booklet*

INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, please fill in your age, sex, and educational status. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any items. Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses -	Completely	Mostly	Partly false	Mostly	Completely
	false	false	and partly true	true	true
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

*William H. Fitts, 1964

1. I have a healthy body.....	1
3. I am an attractive person.....	3
5. I consider myself a sloppy person.....	5
19. I am a decent sort of person.....	19
21. I am an honest person.....	21
23. I am a bad person.....	23
37. I am a cheerful person.....	37
39. I am a calm and easy going person.....	39
41. I am a nobody.....	41
55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.....	55
57. I am a member of a happy family.....	57
59. My friends have no confidence in me.....	59
73. I am a friendly person.....	73
75. I am popular with men.....	75
77. I am not interested in what other people do.....	77
91. I do not always tell the truth.....	91
93. I get angry sometimes.....	93

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

2. I like to look nice and neat all the time.....	2
4. I am full of aches and pains.....	4
6. I am a sick person.....	6
20. I am a religious person.....	20
22. I am a moral failure.....	22
24. I am a morally weak person.....	24
38. I have a lot of self-control.....	38
40. I am a hateful person.....	40
42. I am losing my mind.....	42
56. I am an important person to my friends and family.....	56
58. I am not loved by my family.....	58
60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.....	60
74. I am popular with women.....	74
76. I am mad at the whole world.....	76
78. I am hard to be friendly with.....	78
92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.....	92
94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.....	94

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

7. I am neither too fat nor too thin.....	7
9. I like my looks just the way they are.....	9
11. I would like to change some parts of my body.....	11
25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.....	25
27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God.....	27
29. I ought to go to church more.....	29
43. I am satisfied to be just what I am.....	43
45. I am just as nice as I should be.....	45
47. I despise myself.....	47
61. I am satisfied with my family relationships.....	61
63. I understand my family as well as I should.....	63
65. I should trust my family more.....	65
79. I am as sociable as I want to be.....	79
81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.....	81
83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.....	83
95. I do not like everyone I know.....	95
97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.....	97

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

8.	I am neither too tall nor too short.....	8
10.	I don't feel as well as I should.....	10
12.	I should have more sex appeal.....	12
26.	I am as religious as I want to be.....	26
28.	I wish I could be more trustworthy.....	28
30.	I shouldn't tell so many lies.....	30
44.	I am as smart as I want to be.....	44
46.	I am not the person I would like to be.....	46
48.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.....	48
62.	I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).	62
64.	I am too sensitive to things my family say.....	64
66.	I should love my family more.....	66
80.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.....	80
82.	I should be more polite to others.....	82
84.	I ought to get along better with other people.....	84
96.	I gossip a little at times.....	96
98.	At times I feel like swearing.....	98

Responses -	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
-------------	---------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------

1

2

3

4

5

13.	I take good care of myself physically.....	13
15.	I try to be careful about my appearance.....	15
17.	I often act like I am "all thumbs".....	17
31.	I am true to my religion in my everyday life.....	31
33.	I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.....	33
35.	I sometimes do very bad things.....	35
49.	I can always take care of myself in any situation.....	49
51.	I take the blame for things without getting mad.....	51
53.	I do things without thinking about them first.....	53
67.	I try to play fair with my friends and family.....	67
69.	I take a real interest in my family.....	69
71.	I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).....	71
85.	I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.....	85
87.	I get along well with other people.....	87
89.	I do not forgive others easily.....	89
99.	I would rather win than lose in a game.....	99

Responses -	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

14.	I feel good most of the time	14
16.	I do poorly in sports and games	16
18.	I am a poor sleeper	18
32.	I do what is right most of the time	32
34.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	34
36.	I have trouble doing the things that are right	36
50.	I solve my problems quite easily	50
52.	I change my mind a lot	52
54.	I try to run away from my problems	54
68.	I do my share of work at home	68
70.	I quarrel with my family	70
72.	I do not act like my family thinks I should	72
86.	I see good points in all the people I meet	86
88.	I do not feel at ease with other people	88
90.	I find it hard to talk with strangers	90
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today	100

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

FORM C. AND R.

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

ANSWER SHEET

ITEM NO.	PAGES 5 AND 6	ITEM NO.	PAGES 3 AND 4	ITEM NO.	PAGES 1 AND 2
13	1 2 3 4 5	7	1 2 3 4 5	1	1 2 3 4 5
14	1 2 3 4 5	8	1 2 3 4 5	2	1 2 3 4 5
15	1 2 3 4 5	9	1 2 3 4 5	3	1 2 3 4 5
16	1 2 3 4 5	10	1 2 3 4 5	4	1 2 3 4 5
17	1 2 3 4 5	11	1 2 3 4 5	5	1 2 3 4 5
18	1 2 3 4 5	12	1 2 3 4 5	6	1 2 3 4 5
31	1 2 3 4 5	25	1 2 3 4 5	19	1 2 3 4 5
32	1 2 3 4 5	26	1 2 3 4 5	20	1 2 3 4 5
33	1 2 3 4 5	27	1 2 3 4 5	21	1 2 3 4 5
34	1 2 3 4 5	28	1 2 3 4 5	22	1 2 3 4 5
35	1 2 3 4 5	29	1 2 3 4 5	23	1 2 3 4 5
36	1 2 3 4 5	30	1 2 3 4 5	24	1 2 3 4 5
49	1 2 3 4 5	43	1 2 3 4 5	37	1 2 3 4 5
50	1 2 3 4 5	44	1 2 3 4 5	38	1 2 3 4 5
51	1 2 3 4 5	45	1 2 3 4 5	39	1 2 3 4 5
52	1 2 3 4 5	46	1 2 3 4 5	40	1 2 3 4 5
53	1 2 3 4 5	47	1 2 3 4 5	41	1 2 3 4 5
54	1 2 3 4 5	48	1 2 3 4 5	42	1 2 3 4 5
67	1 2 3 4 5	61	1 2 3 4 5	55	1 2 3 4 5
68	1 2 3 4 5	62	1 2 3 4 5	56	1 2 3 4 5
69	1 2 3 4 5	63	1 2 3 4 5	57	1 2 3 4 5
70	1 2 3 4 5	64	1 2 3 4 5	58	1 2 3 4 5
71	1 2 3 4 5	65	1 2 3 4 5	59	1 2 3 4 5
72	1 2 3 4 5	66	1 2 3 4 5	60	1 2 3 4 5
85	1 2 3 4 5	79	1 2 3 4 5	73	1 2 3 4 5
86	1 2 3 4 5	80	1 2 3 4 5	74	1 2 3 4 5
87	1 2 3 4 5	81	1 2 3 4 5	75	1 2 3 4 5
88	1 2 3 4 5	82	1 2 3 4 5	76	1 2 3 4 5
89	1 2 3 4 5	83	1 2 3 4 5	77	1 2 3 4 5
90	1 2 3 4 5	84	1 2 3 4 5	78	1 2 3 4 5
99	1 2 3 4 5	95	1 2 3 4 5	91	1 2 3 4 5
100	1 2 3 4 5	96	1 2 3 4 5	92	1 2 3 4 5
		97	1 2 3 4 5	93	1 2 3 4 5
		98	1 2 3 4 5	94	1 2 3 4 5

NAME	
DATE	
GRADE	
SEX	
AGE	
CITY	
COUNCIL	
COUNCIL NO.	
COUNCIL NAME	
COUNCIL ADDRESS	
COUNCIL PHONE	
COUNCIL FAX	
COUNCIL E-MAIL	
COUNCIL WEBSITE	

PUBLISHED BY
COUNSELOR RECORDERS AND TESTS
805 6TH AVE. N. ST. A
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37218

© WILLIAM H. PITT 1994

Clinical and Research Form Tennessee Self Concept Scale

SCORE SHEET

HOW THE INDIVIDUAL PERCEIVES HIMSELF

HOW THE INDIVIDUAL PERCEIVES HIMSELF													
IN TERMS OF:	COLUMN A PHYSICAL SELF		COLUMN B MORAL/ETHICAL SELF		COLUMN C PERSONAL SELF		COLUMN D FAMILY SELF		COLUMN E SOCIAL SELF		SELF CRITICISM	ROW TOTALS	
	P-1 P-2 P-3 P-4 P-5 P-6 P-7 P-8 P-9 P-10 P-11 P-12	N-1 N-2 N-3 N-4 N-5 N-6 N-7 N-8 N-9 N-10 N-11 N-12	P-13 P-14 P-15 P-16 P-17 P-18 P-19 P-20 P-21 P-22 P-23 P-24	N-13 N-14 N-15 N-16 N-17 N-18 N-19 N-20 N-21 N-22 N-23 N-24	P-25 P-26 P-27 P-28 P-29 P-30 P-31 P-32 P-33 P-34 P-35 P-36	N-25 N-26 N-27 N-28 N-29 N-30 N-31 N-32 N-33 N-34 N-35 N-36	P-37 P-38 P-39 P-40 P-41 P-42 P-43 P-44 P-45 P-46 P-47 P-48	N-37 N-38 N-39 N-40 N-41 N-42 N-43 N-44 N-45 N-46 N-47 N-48	P-49 P-50 P-51 P-52 P-53 P-54 P-55 P-56 P-57 P-58 P-59 P-60 P-61 P-62 P-63 P-64 P-65 P-66	N-49 N-50 N-51 N-52 N-53 N-54 N-55 N-56 N-57 N-58 N-59 N-60 N-61 N-62 N-63 N-64 N-65 N-66		POSITIVE P + N	CONFLICT NET Algebraic Sum of Pos & Neg Scores
IDENTITY WHAT HE IS	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	91 92 93 94	5 5 5 5 5	1 1 1 1 1
SELF SATIS- FACTION HOW HE ACCEP- TANCE HIMSELF	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	95 96 97 98	5 5 5 5 5	1 1 1 1 1
BEHAVIOR HOW HE ACTS	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1	99 100	5 5 5 5 5	1 1 1 1 1
TOTAL POSITIVE (Σ P + N)	Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Total Positive or P + N	Total Net Conflict (P - N)	Row Tot V
COLUMN TOTALS	Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Σ (Algebraic) P - N		Total Conflict	Col. Tot. V	

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

NUMBER OF $\frac{23 \div 43}{33 \div 43}$ $\frac{23 \div 18}{33 \div 18}$ $\frac{90}{90}$ $\frac{17}{17}$ $\frac{10}{10}$ $\frac{100}{100}$

SELF
COMPLETION
RESPONSES

TOTALS

D = $\frac{23}{33} + \frac{18}{43} + \frac{17}{33} + \frac{10}{43} = \frac{100}{100}$

DP = $\frac{23}{33} + \frac{18}{43} + \frac{17}{33} + \frac{10}{43} = \frac{100}{100}$

GM

PSY = $(100 + \frac{100}{100}) = \frac{100}{100}$

PD = $\frac{23}{33} + \frac{18}{43} + \frac{17}{33} + \frac{10}{43} = \frac{100}{100}$

N = $\frac{23}{33} + \frac{18}{43} + \frac{17}{33} + \frac{10}{43} = \frac{100}{100}$

PI

1. UNPLANNED IN FIFTH 1964

PUBLISHED BY
COUNSELOR RECORDING AND REPRINTS
BOX 6184, ACKLEN STA
MARIETTA, GEORGIA 30067

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form

ADMINISTRATOR

COUNSELOR RECORDS AND TESTS

DATE

INTERVIEW YEAR

NAME	T SCORE	REL CUM	TF	CONFLICT NET TOTAL	POSITIVE SCORES					PERCENTILE SCORES	VARIABILITY COL TOT	DISTRIBUTION					EMPIRICAL SCALES					T SCORE	
					ROW 1	2	3	A	B			C	D	E	D	5	4	3	2	1	DP		GM
	100	2.75	80	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.99		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	90	2.50	70	90	90	90	90	90	90	99.9		90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	
	80	2.25	60	80	80	80	80	80	80	99		80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	
	70	2.00	50	70	70	70	70	70	70	95		70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	
	60	1.75	40	60	60	60	60	60	60	90		60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	
	50	1.50	30	50	50	50	50	50	50	80		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	
	40	1.25	20	40	40	40	40	40	40	70		40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	
	30	1.00	10	30	30	30	30	30	30	60		30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
	20	0.75	0	20	20	20	20	20	20	50		20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
	10	0.50	-10	10	10	10	10	10	10	40		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	0	0.25	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	30		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	-10	0.00	-30	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	20		-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	
	-20	-0.25	-40	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	10		-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	
	-30	-0.50	-50	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	0		-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30	
	-40	-0.75	-60	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-10		-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	-40	
	-50	-1.00	-70	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-20		-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	-50	
	-60	-1.25	-80	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-30		-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	-60	
	-70	-1.50	-90	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-40		-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	
	-80	-1.75	-100	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-50		-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	-80	
	-90	-2.00	-110	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-60		-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	
	-100	-2.25	-120	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-70		-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	
	-110	-2.50	-130	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-80		-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	-110	
	-120	-2.75	-140	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-90		-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	-120	
	-130	-3.00	-150	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-100		-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	-130	
	-140	-3.25	-160	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-110		-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	-140	
	-150	-3.50	-170	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-120		-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	-150	
	-160	-3.75	-180	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-130		-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	
	-170	-4.00	-190	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-140		-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	-170	
	-180	-4.25	-200	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-150		-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	-180	
	-190	-4.50	-210	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-160		-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	
	-200	-4.75	-220	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-170		-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	-200	
	-210	-5.00	-230	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-180		-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	-210	
	-220	-5.25	-240	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-190		-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	-220	
	-230	-5.50	-250	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-200		-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	-230	
	-240	-5.75	-260	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-210		-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	-240	
	-250	-6.00	-270	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-220		-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	-250	
	-260	-6.25	-280	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-230		-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	-260	
	-270	-6.50	-290	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-240		-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	-270	
	-280	-6.75	-300	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-250		-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	-280	
	-290	-7.00	-310	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-260		-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	-290	
	-300	-7.25	-320	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-270		-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	-300	
	-310	-7.50	-330	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-280		-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	-310	
	-320	-7.75	-340	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-290		-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	-320	
	-330	-8.00	-350	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-300		-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	-330	
	-340	-8.25	-360	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-310		-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	-340	
	-350	-8.50	-370	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-320		-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	-350	
	-360	-8.75	-380	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-330		-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	-360	
	-370	-9.00	-390	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-340		-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	-370	
	-380	-9.25	-400	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-350		-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	-380	
	-390	-9.50	-410	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-360		-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	-390	
	-400	-9.75	-420	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-370		-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	-400	
	-410	-10.00	-430	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-380		-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	-410	
	-420	-10.25	-440	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-390		-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	-420	
	-430	-10.50	-450	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-400		-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	-430	
	-440	-10.75	-460	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-410		-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	-440	
	-450	-11.00	-470	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-420		-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	-450	
	-460	-11.25	-480	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-430		-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	-460	
	-470	-11.50	-490	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-440		-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	-470	
	-480	-11.75	-500	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-450		-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	-480	
	-490	-12.00	-510	-490	-490	-490	-490	-490	-490	-460													

APPENDIX C

TAT INSTRUCTIONS

APPENDIX C

TAT Instructions

This is a test of imagination; one form of intelligence. You will be shown four pictures, one at a time, and your task will be to make up as dramatic a story as you can for each. Tell what has led up to the event shown in the picture, describe what is happening at the moment, what the characters are feeling and thinking, and then give the outcome. Write your thoughts as they come to your mind. Do you understand? Since you have twenty minutes for four pictures, you can devote about five minutes to each story. Each picture will be projected on the screen for 4½ minutes, followed by a 30 second pause. The pause will allow you to finish one story and get ready for the next picture. Try to use the entire five minute period.

*Murray, H. A. Thematic Apperception Test Manual
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

7

FEB 19 1969

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293000058218