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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Histrionic personality style is a clinically-derived construct which continues to hold marked relevance for much diagnostic and intervention activity. While this construct has been described extensively in the theoretical literature, it has received remarkably little attention in the research literature. Virtually no systematic investigations have been undertaken to clarify either the definition or measurement of the histrionic personality style. Two factors have contributed to this paucity of research: conceptual confusion in the theoretical literature and the lack of an appropriate measure. The first of these, conceptual confusion, has been particularly vexing. Therefore, before discussing the role of these two factors in the spottiness of research activity, it first will be necessary to clearly define terminology as it will be used in this study.

It is assumed that there exists a distinctive clustering, or constellation, of correlated personality traits designated as "hysterical". This hysterical
trait clustering presumably ranges along a continuum from behaviors and experiences considered normal to those considered abnormal. The manifestation of this hysterical trait clustering that falls within normal limits will be referred to as "histrionic personality style". This trait clustering will be the focus of the present study. The abnormal end of this continuum will be referred to as "hysterical character disorder". This abnormal end of the trait clustering continuum constitutes a maladaptive, caricaturized, extreme version of the histrionic personality style. It is further assumed that histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder are comprised of the same underlying traits, but that the traits differ in degree of expression. Most of the relevant literature has focused on hysterical character disorder. Therefore, the bulk of the information regarding the normal histrionic personality style will be extrapolated from the literature focused on the abnormal hysterical character disorder.

In spite of the literature's emphasis on the abnormal manifestation of hysterical trait clusterings, however, effort also should be expended on studying the normal histrionic personality style, for two reasons.
The first is of theoretical interest. It is commonly assumed that histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder differ in degree of expression of traits. However, they may differ in the exact traits that cluster together or in etiological (e.g., temperamental) underpinnings. The second reason is of applied interest. Hysterical traits have long been considered useful as a basis for significant decisions in various applied settings, both clinical and nonclinical (e.g., medical, academic, and vocational). Therefore, it would be beneficial for practitioners to more fully understand the constructs, their defining features, and their underlying etiological roots in order to make useful applications. Given these two reasons, the current research will focus on the normal clustering of hysterical traits, the histrionic personality style.

The above clusterings of personality traits are to be distinguished from the separate anxiety condition referred to as "hysteria". This clinical notion of hysteria is defined by stylized symptoms of anxiety, not by personality traits. The symptoms may include conversion reactions, dissociated states of consciousness, physical complaints with no apparent organic basis, or phobias. It is expected that
hysterical anxiety symptoms may occur within a disordered hysterical character structure. However, hysteria may also occur in combination with other types of disordered character structures, such as dependent or passive-aggressive.

As noted above, conceptual confusion in the theoretical literature has hindered research. First, the theoretical literature does not typically draw clear distinctions between hysterical character disorder and hysterical anxiety conditions. Although the documentation of hysterical anxiety symptoms and their treatment has been extant for centuries, the discussion of hysterical character disorder has been relatively more recent. However, the constructs have come to be inappropriately considered as interchangeable. Second, two different formulations of hysterical character disorder were initially posited. One view held that hysterical character disorder was a primitive, low-level character structure, with fixations predominantly at the oral stage of psychosexual development. An alternate view contended that hysterical character disorder was a relatively higher-level character structure, with primarily phallic stage fixations. This division remained over the years and contributed to continued
conceptual confusion. Thus, conceptual confusion relating to these definitional problems in the theoretical literature inevitably impacted negatively on the development of systematic research to better define and measure hysterical trait clusterings, since unclear clinical constructs do not make satisfactory research variables.

An additional issue related to this conceptual confusion has been hysterical character disorder's conceptual development within psychoanalytic theory. The strength of the psychoanalytic perspective is that the construct has been described in a rich and insightful manner. However, psychoanalytic personality constructs have traditionally developed independent of the influence of empirical personality research. Thus, there have been no consistent research efforts to connect insights from the largely clinical psychoanalytic perspective on hysterical trait clusterings with the mainstream of personality psychology research. Several lines of personality research dealing with temperament variables are relevant to better defining and understanding hysterical trait clusterings. However, these appear to be either unknown to or dismissed by researchers, since very little
research has examined temperament variables as they relate to hysterical trait clusterings. Hence, research has not guided efforts to further clarify the boundaries of either histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder.

The second reason for the lack of research on hysterical trait clusterings has been the absence of an appropriate measure. Without a suitable measure of hysterical trait clusterings, there is no standard, readily-utilized operational definition to be employed by researchers. Conceptual confusion has likely played a great part in this problem, since a test’s item content and structure depend upon a relatively clear formulation of the construct to be measured. However, development of a measure would also help to clarify conceptual confusion, not only facilitate research. There is a reciprocal relationship between a construct and its measure. Development of a measure serves simultaneously to clarify the construct itself, since the measure and the construct mutually evolve. Findings involving one impact on understanding of the other. Thus, as theoretical formulations progress, these are incorporated into the measure. Likewise, development of the test proceeds as it is increasingly employed. In
the case of hysterical trait clusterings, an appropriate measure would provide a satisfactory operational definition and help to bridge the gap between hysterical trait clusterings research while also helping to conceptually clarify the construct. Thus, development of a measure is the most basic and preliminary issue to be resolved in order for systematic research to proceed. It is on this broad issue that the current study focuses.

In order to evaluate the potential value and utility of a measure, criteria must first be delineated for assessing a test's adequacy. Although a number of scales have been designed to measure hysterical trait clusterings, there has been an overall lack of adequate reliability and validity data. Therefore, a relevant criterion would be psychometric data supporting a test's claims for adequacy. Second, several tests are limited in their definitional scope. Thus, an additional, related criterion would be that the test measure the range of component personality traits that comprise histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder, not just a single component. Next, most scales are not well-grounded in the rich insights drawn from psychoanalytic and other psychodynamic
perspectives. Ideally, a suitable measure would combine this theoretical richness with a sound psychometric base. Finally, some of the available hysterical trait clustering measures are psychopathology-oriented. However, it would be desirable for a test to be applicable to normal as well as abnormal groups. Thus, item content should not be weighted to the extreme, psychopathological end of the continuum since that would render the test of questionable value with normal groups.

Of the available measures of histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder, the Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory’s (LKA; Lazare, Klerman, & Armor, 1966, 1970) Hysterical factor (LKA-H) appears to best meet the criteria of psychometric strength, definitional scope, theoretical richness, and applicability to normal people. First, the LKA-H seems to be among the soundest tests as far as psychometric sophistication; evidence of adequate internal consistency, temporal stability, and replicability of LKA factor structure have been demonstrated. In addition, evidence supporting construct validity has also accrued. Second, the LKA-H is multidimensional, that is, it assesses a number of subscale traits that correlate together to form a
hysterical pattern. Thus, the LKA-H taps a range of hysterical trait clustering components, not just a single component. Third, the LKA-H also meets the criterion of being based in psychoanalytic/psychodynamic theory. Its conceptual foundation and item content have their underpinnings in the rich theoretical-descriptive insights drawn from that perspective. Psychometric data and theoretical views also converge in support of the LKA-H: The test is a factor-analytically-derived scale in which factor loadings are generally consistent with expectations from theory. Thus, the trait subscales that load on the LKA-H are plausible components of histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder. Fourth, the LKA-H seems to lend itself to use with both normal as well as abnormal groups. Items do not appear to heavily pull for psychopathological content. Thus, available data strongly suggest that the LKA-H satisfactorily meets the criteria for an adequate hysterical trait clustering measure.

An additional advantage of the LKA-H, not evident in other tests, is that the structure of its design could potentially contribute to an increased understanding of the histrionic personality style construct itself. Since the test is composed of
different subscales, it is possible to study different arrangements of those subscales, based on highest scores -- in effect, studying subtypes of histrionic personality style. This feature of the LKA-H’s design also offers a novel practical use of the measure, since such LKA-H subtypes have not been previously put forward.

The present study will attempt to address the issue of a suitable measure of histrionic personality style, specifically, the LKA-H. Three research questions will be of interest. The first concerns the consistency of measurement and the factor replicability of the LKA-H with a normal sample: whether satisfactory internal consistency can be demonstrated for the LKA personality trait subscales, whether the LKA’s factor structure will replicate, and whether adequate temporal reliability can be shown for the LKA personality trait subscales and a scale derived from the factor loadings of the LKA-H.

The second research question will address the construct validity of the LKA-H with a normal sample. An adequate measure is dependent on theoretical ideas and quantitative support regarding a construct’s defining features. Whether or not the measure "responds" in the expected direction can then be
verified. An attempt will be made to clarify the nature of the LKA-H's relationships to other, presumed components of histrionic personality style, that is, to other personality variables that are theoretically or empirically related to histrionic personality style. Hypotheses regarding these expected relationships will encompass convergent construct validity. The examination of relationships to variables with which a measure of histrionic personality style should not demonstrate associations will encompass discriminant construct validity.

The final research question will focus on the potential for applied uses of the LKA-H with a normal sample. Hence, delineation and description of subtypes of histrionic personality style within the LKA-H will be investigated. These subtypes will be derived from pairings of the LKA-H's subscales. In summary, the goals of the present research will be to examine the consistency, factor replicability, and construct validity of the LKA-H with a normal sample in an effort to demonstrate the scale's adequacy as a measure of histrionic personality style and to support its continued use. Additionally, potentially practical uses of arrangements of subscale scores will also be explored.
In the current study, the LKA and several other personality measures will be administered to a group of female undergraduates. A subsample of these subjects will complete the LKA one month later in order to assess temporal reliability. There is an implied sexism that surfaces when studying hysterical trait clusterings. Several writers have questioned whether the construct may indeed represent little more than a caricature of women (Chodoff & Lyons, 1958; Compton, 1974; Lerner, 1974). Although there is no solid bank of data indicating that this personality trait clustering is sex-linked, this has been assumed in the literature. Much research has been designed with that assumption in mind. To be consistent with the literature, the present study is also focused on females. However, future research could clearly profit through studying hysterical trait clusterings in males as well.

In summary, the long-standing clinically-derived construct of histrionic personality style has received little quantitative research attention over the years. Consequently, its precise definition and measurement as a scientific construct has remained unclear. The lack of research seems largely due to two factors: conceptual confusion in the theoretical literature and
the lack of an appropriate measure. In order to facilitate research and definition, measure development is considered the most basic and preliminary issue on which to focus. Of the available measures, the LKA-H appears to exhibit the most promise and best meet the criteria for adequacy. Therefore, the goal of the present study is to investigate the LKA-H as a measure of histrionic personality style.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The overall focus of this chapter is on the definition and measurement of hysterical trait clusterings. The chapter is organized in the following manner. Histrionic personality style's defining features, as considered for the purposes of the present study, are presented and contrasted with the features of hysterical character disorder. This is followed by a review of the descriptive literature regarding hysterical trait clusterings. Next is a review of the hysterical trait clustering research literature, focused on studies relevant to defining characteristics. It will be seen that in much of the theoretical and the research literature, work has focused on the hysterical character disorder, not histrionic personality style. Again, it is assumed here that the characteristics described for hysterical character disorder also are found in the description of histrionic personality style. However, they are expressed to a lesser degree. A similar assumption of a continuum of personality
adjustment-maladjustment has been made by several theoretical authors (Blacker & Tupin, 1977; Hollender, 1971; Lazare, 1971; Millon, 1981) and researchers (Magaro, 1986; Magaro, Smith, & Ashbrook, 1983; Miller & Magaro, 1977; Pederson, Magaro, & Underwood, 1982), although it is an issue ultimately to be settled by research. If, however, there is a temperamental foundation to histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder, it is reasonable to speculate that the two differ in the traits' degree of expression.

An overview of temperamental variables from contemporary personality psychology that appear to bear on more fully understanding hysterical trait clusterings is next presented. Suggestions for ways in which these variables could potentially illuminate research on histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder are made. Before such research could be undertaken, however, it would be necessary to have a suitable measure of hysterical trait clusterings. Therefore, measures of hysterical traits are overviewed, with a particular emphasis on reviewing the LKA and the LKA-H literature. Finally, questions and hypotheses for the current study are presented.
Before proceeding, it would be useful to compare and contrast the characteristics of a person with a normal histrionic personality style and a person with an abnormal hysterical character disorder. Underlying traits are assumed to be the same, but the degree of expression is less adaptive as one moves from the normal to the abnormal end of the hysterical trait clustering continuum. People at either end of the continuum manifest certain characteristic interpersonal, emotional, and cognitive styles.

In terms of interpersonal style, a person exhibiting a normal histrionic personality style and someone evidencing an abnormal hysterical character disorder are both typically sociable and dependent on others for affection, approval, and support, though the quality of the dependency differs at the two ends of the continuum. Dependency is more intense and pervasive for someone with a hysterical character disorder than for an individual with a histrionic personality style. The person with an abnormal hysterical character disorder is also more interpersonally manipulative in this regard. Both individuals will manifest periods of child-like helplessness, but the person with a normal histrionic personality style responds in a more adult-like manner when the situation warrants. Someone with an abnormal
hysterical character disorder, on the other hand, does not.

In spite of dependency, a person with a normal histrionic personality style is better able to maintain relationships. For a person with an abnormal hysterical character disorder, however, relationships are often very troubled due to his or her strong need for the other person to provide much support, which the other usually grows to resent. Both people with a normal histrionic personality style and with an abnormal hysterical character disorder may exhibit coquettishness. However, this would be less pervasive and more socially appropriate in a person with a histrionic personality style, though it generally colors interactions and overall style. For someone with a hysterical character disorder, this would be less modulated, more crude, and less appropriate.

Individuals with a normal histrionic personality style and with an abnormal hysterical character disorder both exhibit an emphasis on external appearance and how others perceive them. However, this would be less rigid and less pervasive in a person with a histrionic personality style. In contrast, someone with a hysterical character disorder would be more strongly concerned with issues of appearance and others'
reactions to him or her. The person with a histrionic personality style would be able to move away from self-focus in order to focus on others and their needs; the individual with a hysterical character disorder would not.

Regarding emotional style, characteristics of emotional expressiveness and dramatic demeanor (at times lapsing into histrionics) would be expected in individuals with both a normal histrionic personality style and with an abnormal hysterical character disorder. However, emotional expressiveness would be better controlled and less pervasive in a histrionic personality style without a hysterical character disorder. Emotion would probably also be more deeply felt, though people with a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder are both apt to experience affect in a shallow manner. A person with a normal histrionic personality style would be less emotionally reactive than someone with an abnormal hysterical character disorder. Both seek excitement, are spontaneous, and tend not to consider the consequences of their actions. However, the individual with a normal histrionic personality style would have better control over impulses, better capacity for forethought and planning, better frustration tolerance,
and better ability to delay gratification. The person with an abnormal hysterical character disorder would be impulsive rather than spontaneous, and impulsivity would be less modulated and more pervasive. The person with a normal histrionic personality style has a greater relative capacity for guilt than someone with an abnormal hysterical character disorder.

In terms of cognitive style, both the person with a normal histrionic personality style and the individual with an abnormal hysterical character disorder employ a global cognitive style and repressive defense mechanisms. However, someone with a histrionic personality style would be more flexible and adaptive, while a person with a hysterical character disorder would evidence rigidly fixed cognitive style and defense mechanisms. The individual with a normal histrionic personality style is better able to pursue intellectual tasks, though his or her preference would be for less routine activities. Someone with an abnormal hysterical character disorder would be more limited in capacity for analytic endeavors. Reliance on repressive mechanisms would lead those with a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder to prefer fantasy to reality. Though these people maintain idealized, romantic views of reality, they differ in that the
individual with a normal histrionic personality style would be better reality-grounded and not so swept up in fantasy. Someone with an abnormal hysterical character disorder, on the other hand, would be very caught up in such romanticized notions. In spite of a view of self as helpless and docile, an individual with a histrionic personality style is better able to interact with the world in an assertive manner. In contrast, the person with a hysterical character disorder may not be able to marshal resources to adequately function in the world. He or she is more rigidly set in a view of self as victim, blames others for problems, constantly seeks reassurance and help from others, and has little sense of being an active agent in the world.

Theoretical Contributions to Definition

Hysteria is a psychopathological syndrome made up of neurotic symptoms which may include conversion reactions, dissociative states, physical complaints with no apparent organic basis, and phobias. The existence of this syndrome has been recognized for centuries, although its psychological etiology has been recognized only relatively recently (Veith, 1977). However, hysteria is a collection of symptoms; it is to be
distinguished from histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder, which are clusterings of certain behaviors, cognitive styles, and emotions. These clusterings may be manifested in an adaptive (histrionic personality style) or a maladaptive (hysterical character disorder) range of functioning.

While passing mention may have been made of personality traits that were observed in people with hysteria, there was no systematic formulation of hysterical traits until Wittels (1930) presented one. Although the construct of hysterical character disorder has its roots in psychoanalytic thinking, Freud himself never specifically delineated this construct. The overall thrust of Freud’s work was on symptom formation and amelioration, not on issues of character. Only a few of Freud’s (1908/1959, 1916/1957, 1931/1961) papers specifically included discussions of character (Baudry, 1983). Freud’s works on hysteria (Breuer & Freud, 1893-1895/1955; Freud, 1896/1962) dealt with the neurotic syndrome, not healthy personality traits. The closest he came to discussing a hysterical trait pattern was in a paper regarding character types based on level of libidinal development (Freud, 1931/1961). One of these types, the erotic type, corresponded to current
descriptions of hysterical traits. Thus, loving and being loved were all-important, and fear of losing love made the person very dependent on others. The id was seen as predominant relative to the ego and superego.

The concept of a hysterical character disorder was first specifically addressed by Wittels (1930) and, shortly thereafter, Reich (1933/1972). However, these two theorists assumed differing positions on this construct. Wittels (1930) viewed individuals with a hysterical character disorder as unreliable, not needing to complete things, tending to live in fantasy, and exercising poor impulse control. He described the character disorder as "infantile and feminine" and manifesting an infantile-level fixation. Thus, Wittels (1930) conceived of the hysterical character disorder as a regressed, fairly primitive, impulsive personality structure.

In contrast, Reich (1933/1972) considered hysterical character disorder to result from "a fixation in the genital phase of childhood development, with its incestuous attachment" (p. 206). Primary characteristics of this character disorder were "an importunate sexual attitude" (Reich, 1933/1972, p. 204), combined with "a specific kind of physical agility"
exhibiting a distinct sexual nuance" (p. 204). Also seen as characteristic were coquetry in women and, in men, softness, excessive politeness, and feminine facial expression and bearing. Other qualities included shyness, anxiety (particularly when sexual expectations seemed near) accompanied by subsequent passivity, rapid shifting of attitudes, strong suggestibility, and a vivid imagination that could lead to "pseudologia", that is, "fantasized experiences...reproduced and grasped as real experiences" (Reich, 1933/1972, p. 205). Genital impulses were strong, but ungratified due to genital anxiety.

Continuing within the psychoanalytic framework, Fenichel (1945) discussed hysterical character disorder as a manifestation of traits that corresponded to two conflicts seen in hysteria. The first conflict was between a strong fear of sexuality and strong, though repressed, sexual impulses. The second conflict was related to a tendency to reject reality for fantasy, but then to nevertheless find "the infantile objects again in the environment" (Fenichel, 1945, p. 527). People with hysterical character disorders were described as sexualizing all nonsexual relationships, demonstrating suggestibility, and exhibiting irrational emotional
outbursts, chaotic behavior, dramatization, and histrionics.

By the 1950s, the concepts of hysterical character disorder and its related variants were mired in definitional confusion. Chodoff and Lyons (1958), in a classic paper, noted that the term "hysteria" had at least five connotations:

1. a pattern of behavior habitually exhibited by certain individuals who are said to be hysterical personalities or hysterical characters; 2. a particular kind of psychosomatic symptomatology called conversion hysteria or conversion reaction; 3. a psychoneurotic disorder characterized by phobias and/or certain anxiety manifestations — called anxiety hysteria; 4. a particular psychopathological pattern; 5. a term of approbrium (p. 734).

While the five connotations were not contradictory, neither were they necessarily mutually exclusive. For the most part, they referred to different types of phenomena. Therefore, Chodoff and Lyons consulted various authorities and abstracted definitions agreed upon by most authors. Their description was confined to observable behavior, rather than underlying dynamics, and has been frequently cited:

the hysterical personality is a term applicable to persons who are vain and egocentric, who display labile and excitable but shallow affectivity, whose dramatic, attention seeking and histrionic behavior may go to the extremes of lying and even
pseudologia phantastica, who are very conscious of sex, sexually provocative yet frigid, and who are dependently demanding in interpersonal situations (Chodoff & Lyons, 1958, p. 736).

Easser and Lesser (1965) also offered a reconceptualization of hysterical character disorder, based on their study and analysis of six females diagnosed with a hysterical character disorder. They stated, "The terms hysteria, hysterical character, etc., are so loosely defined and applied so promiscuously that their application to diagnostic categories has become meaningless" (Easser & Lesser, 1965, p. 392). They therefore determined to clarify the concept by presenting seven traits that they believed indicative of hysterical character disorder. These were labile emotionality, direct and active engagement with people, poor response to frustration coupled with overexcitability, a close relationship between excitability and its derivative fantasy, suggestibility, a distaste for and avoidance of detailed, rote, exact, mundane activities, and a close relationship between hysterical irresponsibility and presentation as a child­woman (Easser & Lesser, 1965).

Important contributions to the understanding of cognition in people with hysterical character disorders
have been made by Schafer (1954) and Shapiro (1965). Schafer discussed the reliance on repression as the major defense mechanism in people with hysterical character disorder, with subsequent ego constriction and immaturity. Again, emotional experience was seen as labile and diffuse, and actions were viewed as impulsive. Schafer also noted an impairment in intellectual types of pursuits. Cognitive activity was considered threatening for individuals with a hysterical character disorder because thoughts and fantasies offered "a potential channel of expression of rejected impulses" (Schafer, 1954, p. 194).

Shapiro (1965) offered an in-depth phenomenological analysis of cognitive functioning in the person with a hysterical character disorder. His work has been extremely influential and has been cited time and again in the literature. His thoughts have been routinely included in theoretical discussions (e.g., Bergner, 1982; Blacker & Tupin, 1977; Hollender, 1971; Krohn, 1978; Lazare, 1971; Lionells, 1984) and have been incorporated into accepted clinical lore. He characterized those with a hysterical character disorder as exhibiting a global, diffuse, impressionistic cognitive style which led them to respond to the
immediately striking. The combination of this impressionistic cognitive style with the typical marked incapacity for concentration facilitated repression in two ways:

First, the original cognition is not sharply, factually defined and is not likely to be logically coordinated with other facts...but is impressionistic...and highly susceptible to displacement by or fusion with other previous or subsequent impressions. Second, the relative incapacity for sharply focused attention and concentration and the passive, impressionistic, distractible nature of the cognitive style may be assumed to hold for the recollection process also and to make clear, sharp, factual recollection unlikely under the best of circumstances (Shapiro, 1965, p. 116-117).

Shapiro (1965) also focused on romance, fantasy, and emotion in the hysterical character disorder. Individuals with this character make-up typically have a romantic outlook and remember in a nostalgic, idealized manner that reflects their impressionability and that lacks factual detail. Thus, they often idealize their partners and do not notice objective flaws. They do not search the environment for information but rather, are struck by things. Hence, while the person's subjective world is colorful, it usually lacks substance and fact. People with a hysterical character disorder tend to relate to reality as if things do not count or are not serious. Finally, Shapiro noted the unwittingly
exaggerated, unconvincing quality of emotional expression, indicating the ease with which these individuals are "carried away" by vivid internal or external phenomena. Since they experience emotions as an "alien force" that takes possession of them, strong affects are subjectively perceived as not having really been felt (Shapiro, 1965).

Millon (1981; Millon & Millon, 1974) offered a perspective on the hysterical character disorder that is removed from a psychodynamic framework. Hysterical character disorder was reconceptualized as an "active-dependent" pattern (Millon & Millon, 1974) and later, as a "gregarious" pattern (Millon, 1981). Millon and Millon (1974) described people with hysterical character disorder as actively seeking reinforcement through manipulating interpersonal relationships in order to acquire stimulation and esteem. Their acute sensitivity to the thoughts and moods of others enabled them to determine what behaviors would guarantee them their desired response. They thus lacked loyalty, since they frequently moved from one source of affection and approval to another. Millon (1981) further elaborated on this extreme external orientation, noting that it resulted in a lack of internal psychic development and
richness. Dissatisfaction with single attachments, in conjunction with the strong need for attention and stimulation, were seen as resulting in a seductive pattern and a propensity for the dramatic (Millon & Millon, 1974). Millon (1981) also added a more extended discussion of cognition. Similar to Schafer’s (1954) notions, Millon (1981) believed that intellectual impoverishment served a defensive function in terms of avoidance of potentially anxiety-arousing thoughts. Millon and Millon (1974) listed the central defining features of hysterical character disorder as labile emotions, dissociation of cognitions, an image of oneself as sociable, and interpersonal seductiveness.

Hysterical character disorder has been included in the last three editions of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-II, DSM-III, DSM-III-R; respectively, American Psychiatric Association, 1968, 1980, 1987) as Hysterical Personality Disorder (DSM-II) and Histrionic Personality Disorder (DSM-III and DSM-III-R). There have been similarities in all three versions. In general, the various versions all emphasized emotionality, self-dramatization, attention-seeking, and dependency. DSM-III and DSM-III-R both included Histrionic Personality Disorder as
one of several personality disorders that comprise a dramatic/emotional/erratic cluster.

However, differences may be seen in the way in which diagnostic criteria have been organized. In DSM-II, descriptors of the diagnosis were simply listed. In the two more recent editions of the DSM, diagnostic criteria sets were "polythetic" (Widiger, Frances, Spitzer, & Williams, 1988), that is, a large number of items were included in the diagnosis' description, a specified number of which had to be present before the diagnosis could be made. In the current DSM-III-R, Histrionic Personality Disorder is to be diagnosed when a person exhibits a "pervasive pattern of excessive emotionality and attention-seeking" (American Psychiatric Association, 1987, p. 349), demonstrated by at least four of the following: constant seeking of reassurance, praise, or approval; inappropriate seductiveness; excessive concern with physical appearance; inappropriately exaggerated emotional expression; discomfort when not the center of attention; rapidly changing and shallow emotional expression; egocentricity, need for immediate gratification, and low frustration tolerance; and an excessively impressionistic, rather vague style of speech (American
Psychiatric Association, 1987). The new DSM-III-R version also dropped items that overlapped with the Borderline Personality Disorder diagnosis and added the more traditional feature of inappropriate seductiveness (Widiger et al., 1988).

The theoretical literature is replete with other contributions that essentially reconfirm characteristics that have already been noted (Allen & Houston, 1959; Blacker & Tupin, 1977; Halleck, 1967; Hollender, 1971; Horowitz, 1977; MacKinnon & Michels, 1971). Alarcon (1973) surveyed 22 authors who had written on hysterical character disorder. Of 14 papers that cited six or more characteristics, Alarcon (1973) designated as features of hysterical character disorder those descriptors that had been listed by seven or more authors (see Appendix A). More recently, Bergner (1982) discussed the beliefs of oneself as a helpless victim that mediate behavior in people with a hysterical character disorder and which underlie their interpersonal relationships. Lionells (1984) made an interesting contribution, discussing aggression as a reaction to a disrupted relationship and as an effort to restore, rather than to destroy, the lost attachment.

It should be noted that the differing positions
regarding developmental level of fixation taken by Wittels (1930) and Reich (1933/1972) continued over the years. In a frequently cited paper, Marmor (1953) discussed pregenital oral fixations in hysterical character disorder and sided with Wittels' (1930) formulations. However, Easser and Lesser (1965) sought to bridge this gap by proposing a formal division into "hysterical" (healthier) and "hysteroid" (lower-level) categories. Zetzel (1968) revised and explained this dichotomy more fully. She differentiated between 100 patients evaluated for psychoanalysis on the basis of achievement of developmental tasks. Contemporary with her work was Kernberg's (1967) comparison of hysterical and infantile character disorders (later further elaborated by Sugarman in 1979). Lazare (1971) drew on these sources and presented composites of high- and low-level hysterical character structures. Such a composite approach to differing levels of character has been followed by others (Blacker & Tupin, 1977; Krohn, 1978; Tupin, 1981). Krohn (1978) has been the first to put forward a comprehensive ego-psychological conceptualization of hysterical character disorder and histrionic personality style. Finally, Zisook and DeVaul (1978) presented a critical evaluation of the
healthier end of the continuum proposed by Lazare (1971).

In summary, the history of the constructs of hysterical character disorder and histrionic personality style has been characterized by confusion and lack of definitional clarity. The terms hysteria, hysterical character disorder, histrionic personality style, and so forth, have often been used interchangeably in an inappropriate manner, although it now appears that there is some stable sense of the features of hysterical trait clusterings (e.g., sociability, dependency, emotionality, shallow affect, extraverted style, global cognitive style, repressive defense mechanisms). In addition, the literature has been characterized by an emphasis on the abnormal (i.e., the hysterical character disorder), both in terms of the populations studied and the language used to describe personality.

Research Contributions to Construct Definition

This section reviews research which has investigated the defining characteristics of hysterical trait clusterings and which has studied subjects who were designated as having a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder.
In his review of the research literature, Pollak (1981) stated that most information regarding hysterical trait clusterings has been obtained from case histories and theoretical contributions. However, histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder "as one or more clusters or constellations of specific traits, has not yet been shown to possess adequate empirical validity" (Pollak, 1981, p. 96). Thus, as scientific constructs, histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder have not yet been adequately documented. Nevertheless, findings of various research investigations have suggested the validity of these constructs and hence, support continued research in this area. Consequently, Pollak (1981) called for efforts to "define further the limits of the term...and to devise more reliable and valid measures of this personality construct" (p. 96). The issue of measures will be discussed more fully in a later section. The goal here will be to compile a listing of personality variables that have gained research support as plausible components of histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder.

The use of factor analysis to define hysterical trait clusterings will first be reviewed. This will be
followed by a review of cognitive and affective variables found to be associated with hysterical trait clusterings. Research regarding interpersonal behavior and contemporary personality variables from the temperament domain will follow.

**Factor Analytic Attempts at Definition**

There have been several factor analytic attempts to define a hysterical trait clustering. Finney (1961) collected MMPI responses from males and females applying for outpatient services at a clinic. Items were scored for 56 scales, two individual items, and sex, and these scores were then factor analyzed. Finney (1961) found a "hysterical character or repression" factor in male, female, and combined samples. The previously-published scale with the highest loading on this factor, in all three samples, was Wiener's (1948) "subtle" Hysteria (Hy) subscale, measuring repression and denial. However, the highest factor loadings, again across all three samples, were on an experimental scale, "Rep". This scale included all of Wiener's (1948) "subtle" Hy items, but also included items tapping histrionic dramatization. Finney (1961) noted similarities to Cattell's premsia factor and Lingoes' (1960) Denial of Social Aniety factor.
Magaro and Smith (1981) factor analyzed the scores of male and female introductory psychology students on several personality measures and obtained a Hysterical factor for both sexes. For men, the factor was composed of loadings on social desirability and altruism. For women, the factor loadings were on altruism, field dependence, and sensation seeking's disinhibition component. In another study, Smith, Magaro, and Pederson (1983) administered the LKA and the Multivariate Personality Inventory (MPI; Magaro, 1986; Magaro & Smith, 1981; Miller & Magaro, 1977) to college females. Factor scores from the LKA and the MPI's Hysteric, Compulsive, and Character Disorder scales' scores were factor analyzed. The LKA-H and the MPI Hysteric scale loaded on the same factor.

Pollak (1981) believed that the most noteworthy work bearing directly on factor analytically defining hysterical trait clusterings had been done by Lazare et al. (1966, 1970), using the LKA. Using scores from female in- and outpatients, Lazare et al. (1966) obtained a Hysterical factor composed of Aggression, Emotionality, Oral Aggression, Exhibitionism, Egocentricity, Sexual Provocativeness, and Dependence. Their second factor analysis, in 1970, used scores of
female inpatients and produced a Hysterical factor composed of Aggression, Emotionality, Oral Aggression, Obstinacy, Exhibitionism, and Egocentricity. In both of their studies, Lazare et al. were struck by the presence of Aggression and Oral Aggression on the presumed Hysterical factor. Lazare et al. (1966) felt that these loadings might reflect oral fixations and also "reflect an active, assertive attitude rather than a passive, receptive, withdrawing one" (p. 629). In their later work, Lazare et al. (1970) thought that the factor loadings of Aggression, Oral Aggression, and Obstinacy reflected a primitive hysterical trait clustering resulting from their inpatient sample.

Paykel and Prusoff (1970), using the LKA scores of male and female depressives, produced a Hysterical factor made up of Oral Aggression, Aggression, Sexual Provocativeness, Obstinacy, Exhibitionism, and Emotionality. Smith et al. (1983) factor analyzed the LKA scores of female undergraduates and reportedly obtained a Hysterical factor. However, the traits that loaded on the factor were not cited.

Factor analytic research in foreign, non-English-speaking countries, using translated versions of the LKA, have also obtained Hysterical factors. Van den
Berg and Helstone's (1975) Dutch replication obtained a Hysterical factor with loadings on Oral Aggression, Aggression, Exhibitionism, Sexual Provocativeness, Egocentricity, and Emotionality. Their sample was a mixture of Dutch female psychiatric inpatients and normals. Van den Berg and Helstone offered a reinterpretation of the meaning of the Hysterical factor. They believed that the factor represented an aggressive "reaction pattern". However, they stated that "probably there will be a predelection [sic] of the hysterical person for aggression...as the prevailing reaction pattern" (p. 323).

In two studies, using a revised and translated version of the LKA, Torgersen (1980a, 1980b) found factors corresponding to hysterical trait clusterings. Torgersen (1980a) examined the inheritance of personality traits. His sample consisted of same-sexed monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) male and female twins who had been treated in Norwegian inpatient or outpatient facilities. Factor analysis of a revised and translated LKA provided an "Impulsive Hysteric" factor. Cut-offs for factor loadings to be included in the factor were not given. However, an inspection of Torgersen's (1980a) factor loadings showed that Oral
Aggression, Exhibitionism, Sociability, Aggression, and Emotional Expressiveness all had factor loadings above .50.

Torgersen (1980b) studied environmental and hereditary influences on personality. Again, his sample consisted of male and female MZ and DZ same-sexed twins. A small number of these subjects had been hospitalized for neurotic problems, but the bulk of the sample was obtained through Norwegian twin registries. Torgersen (1980b) factor analyzed LKA trait scores separately for men and women, and obtained Hysterical factors for both. With females, Aggression, Oral Aggression, Emotionality, Exhibitionism, Egocentricity, lack of Emotional Constriction, Obstinacy, and Sexual Provocativeness loaded on the Hysterical factor. Aggression and Obstinacy loaded on the Hysterical factor for males.

Moving away from the LKA, one study investigated factors based on the ratings of others, not self-report data. Presly and Walton (1973) asked psychiatrists to rate male and female psychiatric inpatients on various personality traits. These ratings were subsequently factor analyzed. A factor designated "Hysterical" was obtained, composed of ingratiating, need for attention,
excessive emotional display, unlikeability, and insincerity (Presly & Walton, 1973).

In summary, most of the factor analytic research has been conducted using the LKA. The most frequent LKA loadings have included Aggression, Oral Aggression, Exhibitionism, Emotionality, Egocentricity, Sexual Provocativeness, and Obstinacy. Other, non-LKA-related work has picked up similar traits indicating highly emotional and socially-oriented features. Factor loadings have generally resembled what hysterical trait clusterings would be thought to look like.

Cognitive Variables

A number of studies have examined cognitive processes in people designated as having a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder. Field dependence, global cognition, repression and denial, and intellectual characteristics will be reviewed here.

Field dependence and global cognition. The cognitive style variable of field dependence has been the most consistently examined cognitive variable as related to hysterical trait clusterings. Zuckmann (1957), cited by Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, and Karp, (1962), studied male and female adult outpatients
classified as obsessive-compulsive or hysterical on the basis of Rorschach testing. Subjects in the hysterical group took significantly longer to locate hidden figures on the Embedded Figures Test (EFT). Lawrence and Morton (1974) selected female outpatients with MMPI T-scores greater than or equal to 70 on either the MMPI Hysteria (Hy) or Psychasthenia (Pt) scale. A significant correlation of .71 was obtained between Hy scores and time spent on Jackson's (1956) version of the EFT. A significant chi-square also reflected the association of the Hy scale with field dependence. Morris and Shapiro (1974) found that field dependent females (but not males) from an outpatient psychiatric sample scored significantly higher on the MMPI Hy scale. Italian researchers Fogliani Messina, Fogliani, and Caruso (1982/1983) compared hysterical and obsessive undergraduates with controls. Students with hysterical traits were significantly more field dependent than those with obsessive traits.

Work by Magaro and associates (Magaro & Smith, 1982; Miller & Magaro, 1977; Smith et al., 1983) has examined the relationship between histrionic personality style and, among other variables, field dependence. Miller and Magaro's (1977) report was concerned with
both developing their emerging multivariate theory of personality styles and its measurement with their Multivariate Personality Inventory (MPI). Subjects were upperclassmen from a variety of majors. Hidden Figures Test (HFT; Briggs & Myers, 1962) scores significantly in the field dependent direction, as compared to the sample mean, were found for a small, cluster-analytically-derived Hysteric style group (Miller & Magaro, 1977). More recently, Magaro and Smith (1982) again derived a small Hysteric style cluster based on MPI scores. They found that college females were field dependent on Witkin et al.'s (1972) HFT. A later study by Smith et al. (1983) also found that Hysteric style college females were significantly more field dependent than Compulsive, Character Disorder, and control groups on the HFT. Overall, the research literature is in support of an association between hysterical trait clusterings and a field dependent cognitive style.

In a related vein, two studies have investigated the reportedly global nature of cognition in those with a histrionic personality style. Both studies included comparison groups of subjects with obsessive-compulsive traits. Steele (1969) characterized obsessive-compulsives as exhibiting "vigilant and compulsive
attention to detail, retentiveness, and what may be termed overinclusion of stimuli, while hysterics are contrasted as excluders who avoid or forget stimuli (Cameron & Margaret, 1951)" (p. 80). Male and female undergraduates were classified into groups based on MMPI Hy and Pt scale scores.

Steele (1969) reasoned that, under stress, certain tasks would be easier for hysterics than obsessive-compulsives, and vice versa, since performance would depend on whether or not the task was compatible with the person's customary cognitive orientation. He expected that, under stress, hysterics would do better than obsessive-compulsives on a task that would pull for hysterics' excluding capacity (i.e., the Stroop Color-Word Test). In contrast, obsessive-compulsives were expected, under stress, to do better than hysterics on a complex task that would allow them to utilize their overinclusiveness and attention to detail (i.e., the Embedded Figures Test). Steele (1969) found that subjects in the hysteric group were better able to exclude stimuli and reduce interference from competing stimuli on the Stroop Color-Word Test under both stressful and neutral conditions. His second hypothesis was also supported.

A similar type of study was conducted by Magaro et
Female undergraduates were classified into Hysteric, Compulsive, and control groups based on their MPI scores. Subjects were then tested on a visual search task in which they were to detect a target letter (K) in a letter array. Two types of letter arrays were used, rounded letters (O,C,G,S,Q) and straight-lined letters (V,E,N,L,I). Compared to the other two groups, students in the Hysteric group were predicted to either employ a parallel search strategy (e.g., scanning different aspects of the environment simultaneously) or to less efficiently use a serial processing strategy (e.g., searching methodically and carefully from one aspect of the environment to another). In addition, Magaro et al. (1983) also expected Hysteric group subjects to have more errors, especially under conditions pulling for the serial type of processing (i.e., detecting the letter K within the straight-lined letter array).

The investigators found that the Hysteric group subjects had more difficulty in performing search tasks than the other two groups. Thus, they took more time to find and process the designated target letter and missed the target more often, though they processed the stimuli in a serial manner. In fact, Hysteric group subjects
employed a more serial strategy than either of the other two groups. The authors concluded that "the most conservative interpretation of these data is that Hysterics have a greater difficulty focusing on specific elements in a stimulus field even though they attempt a careful serial analysis of stimulus elements" (p. 137). The researchers speculated that Hysteric subjects might not use a parallel processing strategy as hypothesized, but rather, inefficiently use serial processing. They also noted, however, that Hysteric subjects may indeed prefer parallel processing, but instead employed a serial approach because the task pulled for such a strategy. Thus, they may have been inefficiently using a cognitive strategy that is relatively foreign to them.

Findings of the above two studies lend support to the notion of a global cognitive style in people with a histrionic personality style, although more research is needed to further clarify this issue.

Repression and denial. Curiously, virtually no research has focused on the defense mechanisms of repression and denial in subjects classified as having a histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder. In an early report, Blinder (1966) presented the results of an uncontrolled study in which he utilized a nonstandardized interview format to derive
traits held in common among female psychiatric patients from three different cultures. The women had been diagnosed as having a hysterical character disorder. Among the characteristics he found to be descriptive of the women were the strong use of denial, lack of insight into themselves, and a determination to keep feelings from direct conscious representation.

O'Neill and Kempler (1969) offered an experimental study that bears on the defense of repression. They reconceptualized the reported combination of sexual provocativeness with denial of sexuality in normal histrionic personality style subjects as a sexual approach-avoidance conflict. They then examined the effect of this conflict on perceptual and cognitive processes when sexual and nonsexual stimuli were presented under seductive and sexually neutral conditions. Female college students were classified into histrionic and nonhistrionic groups based on a measure developed by O'Neill (1965). Dependent variables were scores on a paired-associates learning task and on a visual recognition threshold task. It was predicted that histrionics would be more sensitive to sexual stimuli under nonsexual conditions, but selectively unaware of sexual stimuli under seductive
conditions. Findings supported this hypothesis: Histrionic subjects were sensitive to sexual cues under sexually neutral conditions, and also selectively attentive to and avoidant of sexual stimuli under sexually provocative conditions, especially when self-reference was implied. The results of this study are suggestive of a repressive process.

A study by Jordan and Kempler (1970) also examined cognition in females with a histrionic personality style. Jordan and Kempler studied the impact of anxiety over sex-role adequacy in histrionic and nonhistrionic college females. Subjects were classified into groups based on scores on O'Neill's (1965) measure. They were then assigned to no threat, academic threat, and sex-role threat conditions. The dependent variable of interest here was visual recognition for sexual and neutral phrases, with self- (I) and other- (she) referents. Presumably, subjects in the histrionic group, when their sex-role adequacy was threatened, would become more vigilant for cues supporting their feminine competence. Therefore, it was hypothesized that histrionic students in the sex-role threat condition would have a significantly lower recognition threshold for self-referent sexual phrases as opposed
Jordan and Kempler (1970) found this hypothesis to be partially supported. Histrionic students in the sex-role threat condition showed a significantly lower recognition threshold for sexual phrases, regardless of pronoun referent. These results were interpreted to mean that histrionic subjects "became selectively attentive to cues reflecting feminine competence" (p. 175) when they felt their feminine adequacy was being threatened. In addition, however, histrionic personality style students in the academic threat condition recognized neutral phrases, regardless of pronoun referent, significantly faster than sexual phrases. These results are, again, suggestive of a repressive process. However, it is interesting to note that this process apparently can be modified when conditions (e.g., the sex-role threat condition) seem to induce the subject to "prove" herself as feminine.

Three other studies are relevant here. First, in two independent experiments, Miller and Magaro (1977) had college students complete a battery of tests which included the MPI and Byrne's (1961) Repression-Sensitization Scale. Subjects in the first study were introductory psychology students and, in the second
experiment, upperclassmen from a variety of majors. In both samples, subjects in the small Hysteric style cluster evidenced Repression-Sensitization scores in the repressive direction.

Second, Torgersen (1980c) correlated scores between his revised LKA (Torgersen, 1980a) with scores on a post-encounter-group evaluation questionnaire. He found a correlation of -.47, significant at the .10 level, which suggested that the higher the LKA-H score, the less likely the subject was to admit to having experienced dysphoric affect following the group. This could be viewed as a repressive process.

Finally, von der Lippe and Torgersen (1984) found a "marginal" relationship between Hysterical scores on Torgersen’s (1980a) revised LKA and the use of repression (r = .23, p < .10). Repression was measured by Kragh’s (1960) Defense Mechanisms Test.

Overall, the research literature examining repression and denial in hysterical trait clusterings, though very limited, is supportive of these defense mechanisms as defining features. Jordan and Kempler’s (1970) interesting results regarding the modification of these defensive processes (e.g., under conditions when praising "femininity" is salient) would be worthy of further study.
**Intellectual characteristics.** Only two research studies could be located that have investigated the intellectual characteristics of people with a histrionic personality style.

McMullen and Rogers (1984) presented male and female college students with descriptions of histrionic, obsessive, and impulsive modes of functioning, per Shapiro’s (1965) discussion. Students were then asked to rate themselves on a scale of 0 to 10 on how closely the description corresponded to their approach to living. They were then classified as histrionic or obsessive style and administered the WAIS Information, Comprehension, and Vocabulary subtests. Within-group comparisons revealed that the histrionic group’s Information scores were lower than their Comprehension scores, as expected, though not significantly so. However, as hypothesized, their Comprehension scores were significantly higher than their Vocabulary scores. Between groups, the obsessive sample scored significantly higher than the histrionic group on the Information and Vocabulary subtests, as predicted.

Smith et al. (1983) found, as predicted, that their Hysteric group scored significantly higher on the WAIS Object Assembly subtest, in comparison to
Compulsive, Character Disorder, and control groups. It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this extremely limited research. However, the studies have been consistent with what one would expect theoretically in terms of ability to understand socially appropriate behavior, relatively deficient verbal skills, and global-spatial ability.

**Affective Variables**

Research indicates that an affective component appears to be an important feature in histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder. In a series of studies, Slavney and his associates found support for the trait of emotional lability in both normal (Rabins & Slavney, 1979; Slavney, Breitner, & Rabins, 1977) and abnormal (Slavney & Rich, 1980) samples.

Slavney et al. (1977) studied normal females and found a significant, positive correlation of .345 between self-ratings of mood (as measured by the Visual Analogue Mood Scale, or VAMS, of Folstein & Luria [1973] and Luria [1975]) and hysterical traits (as measured by Caine & Hawkins' [1963] Hysteroid-Obsessoid Questionnaire, or HOQ). These researchers believed that the magnitude of the correlation indicated that
emotional lability was but one of a group of traits that correlated together to form the histrionic personality style (Slavney et al., 1977). HOQ scores also correlated positively and significantly with lifetime range of mood (.441) and current range of mood (.345), leading Slavney et al. to conclude that "subjects with more prominent hysterical traits tended to report greater extremes of mood" (p. 158). Slavney et al. therefore also felt that there was a potential for extreme emotions, regardless of depth of feelings, in people with histrionic personality style.

Rabins and Slavney (1979) replicated the above study with a sample of normal males and obtained very similar results. A positive correlation of .29 was found between self-ratings of hysterical traits (HOQ scores) and variability of mood as measured by the VAMS, though the correlation narrowly missed significance (p = .07). However, HOQ scores correlated significantly and positively with lifetime range of mood (.349) and current range of mood (.451). Thus, again, "there was a tendency for more hysterical men to report greater extremes of mood both during the study and retrospectively" (Rabins & Slavney, 1979, p. 302).

Slavney and Rich (1980) focused on the
relationship between variability of mood and hysterical character disorder. Subjects were female and male psychiatric inpatients (though the overwhelming majority of the sample was female). Subjects in the hysterical character disorder group had been so-diagnosed. Control subjects were matched for sex and age, and had a probable neurotic or character disorder diagnosis (but not hysterical character disorder). All subjects completed the VAMS. Results showed that mood variability was significantly greater in the hysterical character disorder group compared to controls. Overall, the Slavney studies support the notion of greater emotional lability in people with hysterical trait clusterings. Emotional lability was also noted by Blinder (1966) in his uncontrolled study.

Findings suggesting affective vulnerability under stress in hysterical character disorder have also been presented. Slavney and McHugh (1974) reviewed chart data from female and male psychiatric inpatients diagnosed either primarily or secondarily as hysterical character disorder. These data were compared with those obtained from a mixed-diagnosis control group of inpatients from the same hospital matched for age and sex. The only personality trait difference between the
two groups was in the tendency for the hysterical character disordered patients to be significantly more likely to be described as "dramatic" upon admission. However, hysterical character disordered patients also exhibited a significantly greater tendency towards depressive symptomatology, with or without a suicide attempt, as a precipitant to their admission. In addition, they were significantly more likely to have had a prior suicide attempt, compared to controls. This finding is consistent with the findings of Standage, Bilsbury, Jain, and Smith (1984), who compared inpatient females diagnosed with hysterical character disorder with depressed inpatient females. Further, a later study by Slavney and McHugh (1975) found that the MMPIs of a hysterical character disordered group of psychiatric inpatients did not differ from those of depressed controls. This led them to conclude that depression is a major risk for patients called hysterical personalities, that the mood is genuinely experienced, and that recognition of this potential for depression should be more clearly acknowledged in definitions of the diagnosis (p. 190).

Overall, research appears to support emotional lability and affective vulnerability under stress as
important characteristics in hysterical trait clusterings. Again, however, the research in this area is quite limited. Focus on the depth or intensity of mood might prove interesting.

**Interpersonal Behavior**

Two experimental studies have investigated the responses of people with histrionic personality styles in interpersonal situations. In Jordan and Kempler's (1970) study, discussed previously, either a no threat, academic threat, or sex-role threat condition was induced via comments made by a male experimenter while the subject was completing a bogus problem task and having her GSR taken. Subjects were then tested by one of two female experimenters on a visual recognition task, followed by subjects completing an evaluation form on both the male and the female experimenter. It was predicted that, as a function of sex-role threat, subjects in the histrionic personality style group would show the highest GSR. Results bore this out; histrionic subjects in the sex-role threat condition had the highest GSRs when critical evaluative comments were made that directly questioned their feminine adequacy.

Jordan and Kempler (1970) also hypothesized that under the sex-role threat condition, histrionic subjects
would more negatively rate the "adequate"-appearing female experimenter, compared to the male experimenter. Results indicated that, when not threatened, the histrionic group rated the male experimenter significantly higher than the female. However, under either the academic or the sex-role threat condition, the male experimenter's ratings were significantly lower than the female's. No significant differences were found between ratings for the male and female experimenters in the nonhistrionic group. The authors interpreted these findings to mean that "the hysteric's reaction to, and impression of others, particularly males, fluctuates markedly with her momentary emotional state, as this relates to acceptance-rejection" (p. 176).

Adams (1976) addressed interpersonal behavior in students with hysterical character disorder by applying the social psychological concept of "ingratiation" (Jones, 1964). Female college students were administered the MMPI. Criteria for selection into the experimental hysterical group were an Hy scale score of $T \geq 65$ and all other clinical scales at least five points below. The "normal" control group had MMPI $T$-scores between 30 and 60 on all clinical scales. (It
should be noted that although Adams used a student population, it is highly likely that she was drawing her experimental subjects from a pathological group within that population. Hence the use of the "hysterical character disorder" designation here.)

Subjects were initially told they would be meeting in a discussion group with other students. They were asked to complete a questionnaire to enable the other discussion participants to know them better before they met for their conversation. It was predicted that hysterical character disorder subjects would describe themselves in a more self-enhancing light than the control subjects. Subjects were then brought together with two other students (confederates, one male and one female) for a discussion of either recent changes in dating behavior (sexually threatening condition) or Watergate and its impact on the country (sexually neutral condition). After 20 minutes of discussion, subjects completed two rating scales on each of the confederates. The expectation was created that the confederates would be shown the subject's ratings of them. A third-order interaction was hypothesized: The most positive ratings would be given to the male confederate by hysterical subjects under the sexually
neutral condition. Conversely, the least favorable ratings were predicted for the male by hysterical subjects in the sexually threatening condition.

Adams (1976) found no support for her first hypothesis that the hysterical group subjects would describe themselves in a more self-enhancing light than the "normal" group. In addition, she also did not obtain the predicted third-order interaction between group, discussion group condition, and sex of confederate on the subjects' ratings of the confederates. However, Adams (1976) did find that subjects in the hysterical group rated the male confederate significantly higher than they rated the female confederate, and significantly higher than the "normal" group rated the male confederate. She noted, "results suggest that hysterics...tend to employ the ingratiation tactic of other-enhancement to ingratiate themselves more with males than with females" (p. 21). This finding is consistent with Jordan and Kempler's (1970) results.

Social desirability's relationship to histrionic personality style has been examined by Magaro (1986; Magaro & Smith, 1981). Insofar as social desirability reflects an attitude regarding presentation of oneself
to the world in a positive light, it could reasonably be expected to influence interpersonal behavior. Magaro and Smith (1981), using a college student sample, found that social desirability (measured by Crowne & Marlowe's [1964] Social Desirability Scale) loaded on a Hysteric factor for males, though not for females. However, a small cluster-analytically-derived male Hysteric group demonstrated a mean social desirability score one-half standard deviation below the sample's mean. Magaro and Smith (1981) interpreted this to mean that "the need to appear in a socially acceptable manner is not present" (p. 803). Magaro (1986, Table 6, p. 61) presented a significant correlation ($r = .20, p < .01$) between Hysteric scores on his MPI and the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (Edwards, 1970) in an undergraduate sample. However, he also presented a correlation between MPI Hysteric scores and Crowne and Marlowe's (1964) Social Desirability Scale ($r = -.19, p < .01$) (Magaro, 1986, Table 6A, p. 62), again utilizing a college student sample. Thus, the relationship between social desirability and hysterical trait clusterings is unclear at this time. From a theoretical viewpoint, however, it seems reasonable to expect that social desirability would be positively related to hysterical trait clusterings.
Three correlational studies have focused on other variables that presumably would affect interpersonal behavior. Self-report of role-taking (Gough, 1948; Mead, 1934), a socialization variable, was examined by Standage et al. (1984). Role-taking was defined as "the ability to perceive and evaluate one's own behavior as it is perceived and evaluated by others in the same culture" (Standage et al., 1984, p. 407). As such, role-taking subsumes the abilities to view oneself objectively, to identify with another's viewpoint, to recognize conflict between one's own needs and those of others, and to anticipate and understand disapproval (Standage et al., 1984). Female psychiatric inpatients diagnosed with a hysterical character disorder were compared with a control group of female inpatient depressives (who did not meet criteria for a diagnosis of hysterical character disorder) matched for intelligence. Hysterical character disorder subjects demonstrated significantly lower scores on a self-report measure of role-taking compared to controls. Consistent with this were comparisons of clinical interview data, which indicated that significantly more hysterical character disordered patients had superficial relationships.
Pederson et al. (1982) studied the differences in self-reported needs on the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) manifested by different personality style groups. Subjects were female introductory psychology students who were classified according to scores on the MPI. The Hysteric style group evidenced scores that presumably would relate to the manner in which the subjects would behave in an interpersonal situation. Thus, Hysteric style subjects, compared to the other personality style groups, had significantly higher scores on EPPS scales of Need for Exhibition, Succorance, Nurturance, and Heterosexuality. Significantly lower scores for Hysteric subjects were found on the EPPS scales of Need for Autonomy and Abasement.

The final correlational study which examined variables that would be thought to inform on how people would behave interpersonally was carried out by Miller and Magaro (1977). They found that Hysteric style college students (classified based on their MPI scores) evidenced significantly higher scores on a Positive Values Towards People factor.

The sparse quantity of research in this area leads to caution in drawing firm conclusions. However, the
studies' results have been consistent with theory-based ideas of what the interpersonal behavior and motivation of people with a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder would be. In general, research has supported the importance of needs and behavior related to affiliation, dependency, and acceptance, and, overall, a sociable, people-oriented approach to life. The role of social desirability remains unclear. Particular significance seems to be placed on males' approval. There was also a suggestion of superficial relationships, and a tendency to have difficulty in moving to a less self-centered orientation. While this egocentricity could be viewed as inconsistent with the sociable, people-orientation noted above, it may actually be complementary. The dependent, other-orientation could be seen early on in relationships with people with a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder, with self-centeredness becoming manifest as the relationship develops.

Contemporary Temperament Variables

A piecemeal collection of studies has examined the relationship between hysterical trait clusterings and extraversion and sensation seeking. The bulk of
these studies have focused on extraversion and have been carried out by British researchers, using various measures of extraversion and hysterical trait constellations.

**Extraversion.** Several studies have indicated a relationship between extraversion (E) and hysterical traits. A number of these reports employed Caine and Hawkins' (1963) Hysteroid-Obsessoid Questionnaire (HOQ) as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. Caine and Hope (1964) tested neurotic male and female inpatients and reported a significant correlation of .70 between E as measured by the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MP; Eysenck, 1959) and the HOQ (on which higher scores are indicative of a more hysterical orientation). MP-E and HOQ scores were also correlated by Foulds, Caine, Adams, and Owen (1965), who obtained significant correlations of .84 for neurotics and .81 for normals. Barrett, Caldebeck-Meenan, and White (1966) found a significant correlation of .66 between the MP-E and the HOQ scores of army personnel. HOQ scores were correlated with the 16-PF second-order extraversion factor by Forbes (1969) in a sample of acute psychiatric inpatients and a significant correlation of .79 was obtained.

The Middlesex Hospital Questionnaire's (MHQ; Crown
& Crisp, 1966) Hysterical subscale (MHQ-H) has also been used as a measure of hysterical traits. Young, Fenton, and Lader (1971) correlated MHQ-H scores with E scores from Eysenck and Eysenck's (1971) Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism questionnaire. They found a significant correlation of .36 in their sample of normal male monozygotic and dizygotic twins. Bagley (1980) reported a significant correlation of .31 between MHQ-H scores and Eysenck's E (E measure unspecified) in a college student sample.

Other measures of hysterical traits have also been employed in examining the relationship between E and hysterical trait clusterings. Paykel and Prusoff (1973) obtained a significant correlation of .39 between MP-E and LKA-H scores in a sample of depressed patients. And Ingham and Robinson (1964) found that MP-E scores were associated with hysterical personality and a hysterical attitude toward's one's illness in a neurotic population.

Overall, the above results strongly support the presence of E in hysterical trait clusterings. However, the degree to which E is present is open to question on two grounds. First, it is not clear if E and hysterical trait clusterings are distinct constructs. Pollak
(1981), following from Crown (1974, 1975), noted that the relationship between E and hysterical trait clusterings raises important questions as to the precise boundaries between the two constructs and whether hysterical personality should be viewed as a legitimate construct in its own right or whether it should be conceptualized simply as a somewhat extreme form of extraversion (p. 90).

Second, the magnitude of the correlations varies with the measures being used. It is striking that higher correlations between E and hysterical trait clusterings were consistently obtained with one measure (the HOQ) than with others. It is therefore difficult to know whether the degree of correlation reflects an artifact of hysterical trait clustering measurement or the actual relationship between hysterical trait clusterings and E. In addition, virtually all of the studies utilized the old forms of the E scale, in which sociability and impulsivity components were intermixed. Eysenck and Eysenck’s (1975) most current measure, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), has an E scale which taps primarily sociability (discussed further in the next chapter).

The effect of this purification of the E scale on information regarding hysterical trait clusterings is
not clear. Thus far, only Standage et al. (1984) have used the EPQ to examine differences between people with and without hysterical traits. Subjects were female psychiatric inpatients diagnosed with either a hysterical character disorder or depression. The groups did not differ on their E scores. However, compared to depressed controls, subjects in the hysterical character disorder group showed significantly higher scores on the EPQ Psychoticism scale and significantly lower scores on the EPQ Lie scale. These findings suggest impulsive and sociopathic tendencies in hysterical character disorder subjects, combined with a tendency to not employ denial. However, Standage et al. (1984) believed that the experimental subjects could have also met diagnostic criteria for other character disorder groups, such as the antisocial type. Thus, the generalizability of the results to people with hysterical character disorders was open to question. Therefore, more research will need to be done using the EPQ's revised measure of E.

**Sensation seeking.** Sensation seeking's relationship to histrionic personality style has been examined in two studies. First, Miller and Magaro (1977) used cluster analysis to form small Hysteric style groups (based on MPI scores) in two experiments.
Subjects were college students. In both experiments, Hysteric students' scores on the Sensation Seeking Scale (SSS; Zuckerman, Kolin, Price, & Zoob, 1964) deviated one-half of a standard deviation from the total sample mean, which was considered to be significant. Thus, Hysteric style subjects were seen as high in sensation seeking.

In a second study, Magaro and Smith (1981) again developed clusters of Hysteric style groups, but this time separated males and females. Again, Zuckerman et al.'s (1964) SSS was administered to the college student sample. Magaro and Smith (1981) found that female Hysteric style subjects showed elevations on the Thrill and Adventure Seeking and the Disinhibition subscales of the SSS. Male Hysteric style subjects obtained an elevation on the SSS's Experience Seeking scale.

While the results of both of these reports are suggestive, the small sample sizes of the clusters lead one to exercise caution in accepting the findings as conclusive. Clearly, sensation seeking's role in hysterical trait clusterings is an issue to be explored in future studies.

Conclusions

It is possible to draw tentative conclusions
regarding the plausible components of hysterical trait clusterings, based on the research literature.

Perhaps the strongest, most extensive, evidence is available from the factor analytic research. Those findings supported the validity of the construct of hysterical character disorder and, to a lesser extent, the histrionic personality style. Factor loadings have generally matched with theoretical notions of what a hysterical trait clustering factor would look like. Most frequent LKA factor loadings include Aggression, Oral Aggression, Exhibitionism, Emotionality, Egocentricity, Sexual Provocativeness, and Obstinacy. Other, non-LKA-related work found support for characteristics of emotionality and social orientation.

Among cognitive variables, most research has focused on the association between field dependence and hysterical trait clusterings and has developed support for this association. Other studies have additionally suggested a relationship between hysterical trait clusterings and repression and denial, as well as ability to comprehend social propriety, relatively deficient verbal skills, and global-spatial ability. Regarding affective variables, emotional lability and affective vulnerability appear to be related to
hysterical trait clusterings. Research further suggested that interpersonal behavior is characterized by a sociable, people-oriented manner and that affiliative, dependent needs are significant. Males’ approval may be particularly important. Results were also suggestive of a superficial manner and self-centeredness, while the role of social desirability is unclear. Finally, support was available for extraversion and sensation seeking as components of hysterical trait clusterings.

Conclusions from the research should be tempered, however, by four major overarching criticisms. First, most of the research has predominantly employed clinical samples. However, normal samples are also important to investigate, for two reasons. First, from a theoretical perspective, it is important to determine possible differences between histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder in terms of the traits which cluster together or in etiological or primary trait underpinnings. This is a meaningful inquiry because the assumption made here, as well as by others, is that histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder are composed of the same traits, with only differences in degree of expression. The question
centers on identifying the common traits. This assumption, however, is subject to research validation. The second reason relates to applied concerns. Hysterical trait clustering constructs have been of utility in both clinical and nonclinical (medical, vocational, and academic) settings. Thus, it would be beneficial to practitioners to more fully understand both the normal and abnormal manifestations of these constructs, their defining features, and their underlying etiological roots.

A second criticism of the research literature is that samples have been overwhelmingly female. Consequently, there is a need to study histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder in males. The central issue is whether identifiable hysterical trait clusterings are demonstrated by males. Other related questions include what particular traits might comprise such clusterings in men, what are the etiological roots, and whether hysterical trait clusterings can be differentiated from other diagnostic categories in males. For example, are males who exhibit hysterical traits instead classified as antisocial? See Slavney (1984) and Widiger et al. (1988) regarding this issue.
Third, the inconsistent, nonstandardized operational definitions of hysterical trait clusterings employed among the various studies make it difficult to compare results and to know if a common definition of hysterical trait clusterings is being applied. It is important, therefore, to attempt to develop a suitable measure for hysterical trait clusterings. Finally, the fourth criticism is that the research literature is not extensive or well-developed. With few exceptions, the research literature has been piecemeal and haphazard in terms of the personality variables under investigation. There have been no systematic attempts to broaden the scope of understanding of histrionic personality style or hysterical character disorder. One way to do this would be to bridge into temperament variables in the current personality psychology research literature.

The next section of the literature review will provide an overview of current research in the personality literature which has focused on the temperamental underpinnings of personality. This area of the personality literature could potentially be a fruitful area of inquiry for investigators of hysterical trait clusterings. Some suggestions of how temperament variables could explain clusterings of hysterical traits will also be put forward.
Contemporary Temperament Approaches to Personality

A convergence of research themes has developed within current personality psychology, focused on the temperament variables thought to underlie individual differences in behavior. Temperament, once a discarded construct, has gained increasing currency in the realm of personality (Strelau, 1987). Temperament variables are of potential relevance to more fully understanding and defining the boundaries of the histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder constructs. However, as seen in the previous section, most of these variables have received no serious systematic attention from researchers concerned with studying hysterical trait clusterings. Either researchers have not been aware of developments in contemporary personality psychology, or they have chosen not to focus on this area of potentially fruitful hypotheses. The former reason seems more likely; much of the hysterical trait clustering research has been carried out by clinical professionals, many of whom are less likely to be current in their knowledge of the personality field than academic researchers. However, although bridging the hysterical trait clusterings
literature with temperament research could be illuminating, such a bridging would be greatly facilitated by the procurement of a satisfactory, accepted measure of such clusterings.

The goal of this section is to present an overview of the temperament literature. First, an overview of common themes in temperament research is presented. This is followed by summaries of work regarding the temperament variables of extraversion (Eysenck, 1967; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976), sensation seeking (Zuckerman, 1979), activation (Thayer, 1985), reactivity and activity (Strelau, 1985a, 1985b), and affect intensity (Larsen & Diener, 1987). Finally, the potential application of this research literature to understanding hysterical trait clusterings is presented in the last part of this section.

Overview of Common Themes

Certain themes run throughout the temperament research. Various researchers have converged on the general notion of differences in cortical arousability as accounting for differences in behavior. According to this position, there is a basic need for stimulation, stimulation which results in cortical arousal. Sources of stimulation may be external or internal, but social
stimulation has been considered to be particularly potent in increasing arousal (Eysenck, 1967; Gale, 1986; Larsen & Diener, 1987; Zuckerman, 1985). Individuals seek to maintain an optimal level of arousal, and so consequently seek to regulate stimulation at an optimal level. These attempts to regulate amount of stimulation are manifested in behavior. Thus, people who are highly arousable would seek to maintain stimulation at a minimum and will therefore behave in a manner so as to decrease their stimulation. Conversely, those who are low in arousability will behave so as to increase their amount of stimulation.

Gale, Strelau, and Farley (1985) listed a set of themes that recur throughout the temperament research. The themes directly relevant to personality processes were as follows:

1. Individual variation is, in part, attributable to biological factors.

2. Such factors are transmitted through genetic mechanisms.

3. There is a constant interplay between biologically determined dispositions and physical, biochemical, and social events.

4. The individual is seen as regulating crucial aspects of this interplay.

5. The principles of regulation are themselves derivable from the biological dispositions and their interaction with the external world.
6. Factors that play an important role in the regulation of behavior are arousal level, optimal levels of arousal, optimal levels of stimulation, changes in stimulation, and activity. All these constructs are in some sense related to the input and output of energy.

7. The dispositional variables may be tapped by use of psychometric instruments.

8. Because of the range of identified dispositional variables and because each person evolves within a constantly emerging feedback system, it is not expected that there will be a simple one-to-one relation between trait variables and behavior...

9. The appropriate description of the individual will encompass behavioral, psychophysiological, and experiential domains... (Gale et al., 1985, p. 18).

A representative sampling of some of the best-known and/or productive temperament researchers will provide fuller illustrations of the concepts thus-far outlined.

**Extraversion**

Perhaps the best-known and most prolific work regarding the temperamental underpinnings of behavior has been provided by Eysenck (1967; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976). Eysenck has long-employed a factor analytic approach in deriving dimensions of personality. He conceptualized personality as falling within a three-dimensional space defined by axes (orthogonal factors)
of extraversion (E), neuroticism (N), and more recently, psychoticism (P). Schalling and Åberg (1985) noted that individuals "high in extraversion are described as sociable, outgoing, carefree...those high in neuroticism as nervous, moody, restless, and excitable; those high in psychoticism as aggressive, cold, cruel, and bizarre" (p. 181). The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) measures these traits.

Eysenck has related E, N, and P to different physiological mechanisms. Hence, N has been linked to the potential for activation in subcortical structures (Eysenck, 1967), while P has been related to hormonal secretions (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976). E, the trait of most direct relevance here, has been related to differences in threshold of arousal in the ascending reticular activating system (ARAS) and the excitatory-inhibitory feedback loop between the ARAS and the cortex (Eysenck, 1967). Extraverts were considered to have a higher threshold of arousal and to exhibit greater adaptation/inhibition in response to continued stimulation (Eysenck, 1967). Conversely, introverts were viewed as having a lower threshold of arousal and less adaptation/inhibition (i.e., more excitation) in
response to continued stimulation (Eysenck, 1967).

In addition, Eysenck (1967) also suggested that extraverts, compared to introverts, had an inborn lower baseline level of arousal and generally preferred a higher arousal level as optimal. He therefore postulated, "a certain degree of stimulus hunger (sensation seeking, arousal) in the extravert, and a certain degree of stimulus aversion in the introvert" (Eysenck, 1967, p. 110). Thus, extraverts are more likely to seek out additional sources of stimulation in order to raise their chronically low level of arousal. Introverts, on the other hand, will seek to decrease the amount of stimulus input, in an effort to decrease stimulation and thereby lower their chronically high level of arousal.

Eysenck’s (1967) ideas have not been without controversy, even from within his own ranks. Gray (1981), a former student of Eysenck’s, believed that the primary dimensions of personality were impulsivity and anxiety. These are located at 45 degree angles from Eysenck’s E and N dimensions. Gray’s (1981) views have been criticized by Eysenck (1987).

Sensation Seeking

Zuckerman’s (1979) sensation seeking construct was
also developed via factor analytic techniques. Sensation seeking (SS) grew out of Zuckerman's original efforts to study individual differences in response to sensory deprivation. In its most recent revision, SS was considered as, "a trait defined by the need for varied, novel, and complex sensations and experiences and the willingness to take physical and social risks for the sake of such experience" (Zuckerman, 1979, p. 10). Sensation seekers' intolerance for constant arousal level or experiences has been particularly noted (Zuckerman, 1985). SS is measured by the Sensation Seeking Scale (SSS; Zuckerman, 1979), which taps four oblique factors that are subtypes of SS:

- **Thrill and Adventure Seeking (TAS)** items reflect desires to engage in sports and other activities involving some physical risk...

- **Experience Seeking (ES)** items represent the seeking of stimulation through the mind and senses, through travel, music, and art, and through unconventional social behavior and friends...

- **Disinhibition (Dis)** items are characterized by the seeking of social and hedonistic stimulation...

- **Boredom Susceptibility (BS)** items reflect an intolerance for sameness and routine situations or people, and restlessness when such situations or persons cannot be avoided (Zuckerman, 1985, p. 102).

Scores are computed for each factor. In addition, these scores are also totaled to derive a General SS score.
In Zuckerman's (1969, 1974) original theory, optimal level of arousal (OLA) and optimal level of stimulation (OLS) were incorporated as the biological bases for SS. He had initially believed that sensation seekers searched for novel, intense, and complex stimulation that would maintain a high level of (cortical) arousal (Zuckerman, 1985). He assumed that, "those with high OLAs need more stimuli with high arousal potential (high...OLS) to feel good and function better" (Zuckerman, 1985, p. 99). Thus, he has postulated a direct relationship between SS, OLA, and OLS.

However, Zuckerman (1985) noted that it became difficult to reconcile accumulating data with an OLA theory of SS. While high sensation seekers sought out novel, complex experiences, these activities frequently were not arousing (e.g., meditation groups; no clear preference for stimulant drugs), but pointed up the high sensation seekers' preference for lack of constancy in arousal level (Zuckerman, 1985). Such findings led Zuckerman (1979, 1985) to move "beyond the optimal level of arousal" (Zuckerman, 1985, p. 107) and to attempt to incorporate the biological correlates of SS which have been uncovered in recent years. While he retained the
idea of an OLA, he also suggested that differences in degree of SS could be related to the pharmacology of the limbic reward system (Zuckerman, 1979, 1985). These reward systems were viewed as regulating arousability via effects on the reticular activating system (Zuckerman, 1985).

**Activation**

Another factor analytic approach is represented by the work of Thayer (1978a, 1978b, 1985). While not as extensively conceptualized and researched as Eysenck's and Zuckerman's constructs, Thayer's contributions are nevertheless of interest and relevance, and have gained recent application (see Thayer, 1987).

Thayer's (1985) work has focused on the two dimensions of activation (arousal) that he believed underlie and energize behavior. He stated that behavior can be divided into two aspects, "its direction, approach, or withdrawal (not necessarily overt) and also...its intensity, activation, or arousal" (p. 115). Further, he believed that one or more intensity, or activation, continua (involving energy expenditure) directly influence a major portion of behavior by serving as "predispositional states". Thus, while such activation dimensions were not the only determinants
of behavior, they nevertheless increased the likelihood of particular behaviors.

Using the Activation-Deactivation Adjective Check List (Thayer, 1978a), four oblique factors were obtained:

General Activation (energetic, vigorous, lively, full of pep, active, peppy, and activated);
Deactivation-Sleep (tired, sleepy, drowsy, wide-awake, and wakeful); High Activation (tense, anxious, jittery, clutched-up, fearful, intense, and stirred-up); and General Deactivation (still, quiet, placid, at rest, calm, leisurely, and quiescent) (Thayer, 1985, p. 116).

These four factors form two separate second-order factors (Thayer, 1978a, 1985). The first has been designated Activation Dimension A, considered to be an "energy-sleep" (Thayer, 1985) dimension with General Activation at one end and Deactivation-Sleep at the other. The other second-order factor, Activation Dimension B, was believed to be a "tension-placidity" (Thayer, 1985) continuum, with High Activation and General Deactivation at opposite poles. Although Thayer (1985) stated that the nature of neural processes in these activation dimensions was "unclear", he suggested that the reticular activating system and the limbic system may likely be involved in their operation. The
biological function of Activation Dimension A was viewed as "the necessary mobilization and expenditure of energy for survival and propagation, alternated with periods of conservation" (Thayer, 1985, p. 123). Activation Dimension B was seen as having two biological functions: preparing for physical activity and providing a warning of impending danger (Thayer, 1985).

**Reactivity and Activity**

An important Eastern European approach, based in Pavlov's work on types of nervous system, is Strelau's (1985a, 1985b) regulative theory of temperament. Strelau's early research focused on Pavlov's nervous system typology and he utilized an experimental methodology in classifying nervous system types. However, Strelau grew dissatisfied with his results and instead developed the Strelau Temperament Inventory (STI; Strelau, 1972) as a classification instrument (Strelau, 1985a). The STI measures Pavlovian concepts of strength of excitation, strength of inhibition, mobility of nervous processes, and equilibrium of nervous system (Strelau, 1985a). Though Strelau moved away from Pavlov's ideas, he nevertheless believed that the concepts measured by the STI were of use in assessing temperament (Strelau, 1985a). Reactivity and
activity, Strelau’s (1985a, 1985b) key theoretical constructs, were not derived through factor analytic techniques, but rather, "are the result of theoretical considerations" (Strelau, 1985a, p. 31).

Strelau (1985b) considered temperament to be, "a set of formal, relatively stable traits revealed in the energy level of behavior and in the temporal characteristics of reaction" (p. 32). Energy level of behavior was believed to have two components, reactivity and activity (Strelau, 1985a, 1985b). Reactivity was viewed as temperament’s primary dimension by Strelau (1985a) and was defined as "a relatively stable and typical intensity of response to stimuli" (Strelau, 1985b, p. 32), with stimuli deriving from either internal or external sources. According to Strelau (1985b, p. 33):

The weaker the stimulus that elicits a perceptible response (the higher the sensitivity) and the weaker the stimulus that starts to lower efficiency (the lower the resistance), the higher is an individual’s reactivity; conversely, a low-reactive person is marked by low sensitivity and high resistance.

Strelau’s (1985a, 1985b) second temperament feature was activity. This was defined as "a temperament feature which reveals itself in the amount and range of undertaken action of a given stimulative value" (Strelau, 1985a, p. 25). People were seen as
providing themselves with stimuli until they achieved a certain optimal level of activation (arousal) (Strelau, 1985a, 1985b). This optimal activation, or arousal, level becomes a need, and people work to increase or decrease stimulation in order to maintain their arousal at their own preferred level (Strelau, 1985a, 1985b). Activity, then, "plays primarily the regulatory function in providing or maintaining the optimal level of activation" (Strelau, 1985a, p. 26). However, activity itself may be a source of stimulation (Strelau, 1985a, 1985b). Thus, activities may generate an emotional response, which would in turn result in an activated or aroused state. Relating reactivity with activity, Strelau (1985b) stated:

Reactive persons...have a low need of stimulation required for attaining optimal activation....less reactive persons...provide themselves with a larger number of stimuli to maintain the optimal level of activation, and thus they show a high need of stimulation....highly reactive people avoid situations and activities that bring along strong stimulation...less reactive persons undertake activities and look for situations that possess a high stimulating capacity. In consequence, weakly reactive people are generally more active, and highly reactive ones show lowered activity (pp. 33-34).

Affect Intensity

Strelau (1987) indicated that there has been a
"clear-cut tendency...to link individual differences in emotions with temperament" (p. 511). This tendency in the emotion literature was recently illustrated by Larsen and Diener (1987), when they discussed temperament explanations for individual differences in affect intensity. Affect intensity (AI) refers to "stable individual differences in the strength with which individuals experience their emotions" (Larsen & Diener, 1987, p. 2). Larsen and Diener (1987) viewed this construct as generalizing across specific emotions. Thus, people who strongly experience positive emotions will also tend to experience negative affect intensely.

Two measures of AI have been developed. The first, an adjective checklist of moods, is completed on a daily basis over a long period of time (Larsen and Diener, 1987). However, the Affect Intensity Measure (AIM; Larsen, 1984) was developed in order to help expedite the research process. The AIM measures the degree to which a person typically experiences his or her emotions (Larsen & Diener, 1987).

AI was considered to be a temperament dimension since it focused on the process, not the content, of behavior, and it was stable over time (Larsen & Diener, 1987). Larsen and Diener (1987) postulated biological
functions and underpinnings of AI and proposed an "Arousal Regulation Theory of Affect Intensity". They suggested that emotional responses serve as a source of stimulation to overcome individual differences in baseline arousal:

individual differences in affect intensity exist, at least in part, because emotional responses function as a source of stimulation for use in arousal regulation. Individuals develop strong emotional responsiveness to compensate for an otherwise chronically low level of baseline arousal (pp. 29-30).

Potential Applications of Temperament Research to Understanding Hysterical Clusterings

Hysterical trait clusterings may be conceptualized in terms of the temperament dimensions discussed above. Generally, people with a histrionic personality style or a hysterical character disorder may be viewed as having suboptimal levels of cortical arousal, which they therefore seek to increase by increasing external or internal stimulation. Presumably, these individuals would be high on Eysenck's (1967; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976) E, high on Zuckerman's (1979) General SS dimension (and likely to be high on certain SS subfactors, probably depending on whether the sample was drawn from a normal or abnormal population), low on Strelau's
(1985a, 1985b) reactivity and high on his activity dimensions, and high on Thayer's (1985) Dimension A. In addition, they may be more likely to experience affect strongly, though, as discussed below, this is less clear. Although work at theoretical as well as empirical levels needs to proceed in order to better distinguish these various temperament constructs from one another (Gale et al., 1985), they nevertheless have potential for more clearly defining and understanding the underlying processes and etiological roots of hysterical trait clusterings. Examples of their possible application are discussed below.

Interpersonal behavior may be accounted for from a temperament viewpoint. Sociability and a people-orientation are characteristics of hysterical trait clusterings that have often been noted in the theoretical and, to some extent, the research, literature. It is possible that temperament accounts to some degree for these characteristics. Several researchers (Eysenck, 1967; Gale, 1986; Larsen & Diener, 1987; Zuckerman, 1985) have noted that social stimulation constitutes a potent source of stimulation and hence, arousal. From a temperament perspective, people with a histrionic personality style or a
hysterical character disorder may be chronically below their optimal level of stimulation, or require a great deal of intense stimulation in order to reach their optimal level, or both. Thus, they may have learned to seek out social stimulation in order to increase cortical arousal to its optimal level. In this regard, the often-noted strong proclivity towards the opposite sex in people with hysterical trait clusterings may be explainable. It seems likely that, if social contact in general is arousing, then social contact with the opposite sex may be particularly activating.

Cognitive variables may also be explainable by employing a temperament viewpoint. If one assumes that extraverts (Eysenck, 1967) and impulsives (Gray, 1981) correspond to people with hysterical trait clusterings, other temperament findings can be potentially illuminating. Extraverts and impulsives are "inclined to experience positive hedonic tones" (Strelau, 1987, p. 524) and tend to be more susceptible, or attuned to, signals of reward (Strelau, 1987). It is also possible, then, that people with hysterical trait clusterings are likewise differentially susceptible to reward signals. Presumably, people who are attuned to or primed for reward signals would likely have greater expectations of
reward, since rewards dominate their view of the world. Thus, the higher a person would be on this speculative extraversion/impulsivity/hysterical trait clustering dimension, the more salient would rewards be for him or her in his or her experience of the world and therefore, the greater his or her expectations of reward.

High expectations of reward could easily result in an optimistic, sunny disposition and a tendency to focus on the positives over the negatives, both of which are consistent with theoretical views on hysterical trait clusterings. In addition, a cognitive orientation of high expectations of reward would fit well with a defensive orientation of repression and denial. This would fit because the person would not be set or attuned to negative events. Thus, there may be a temperament basis for repression and denial. Such a basis could also explain the prevalence (noted earlier) of depression in people with hysterical character disorders (Slavney & McHugh, 1974, 1975; Standage et al., 1984). These individuals may not anticipate or notice impending losses or other negative events, and thereby cannot prepare appropriate responses. Therefore, when environmental stresses inevitably occur, it is as if the
rug has been pulled out from under them, while others have probably seen the problems or stressors coming.

Affect in histrionic personality style and hysterical character disorder could also be approached from a temperament perspective. Affect is a particularly salient feature of hysterical trait clusterings, in both the theoretical and the research literature. The value of emotion as an arousal-inducer seems clear. Thus, the hysterical storm of affect could serve to increase arousal to an optimal state. This would then dissipate relatively rapidly, resulting in another build-up of need to strongly express affect. This type of build-up/dissipation cycle could account for the significance of emotional expressiveness in people with hysterical trait clusterings. However, the hysterical trait clustering research has not directly addressed the issue of the intensity with which emotion is experienced in people with hysterical traits. According to Larsen and Diener's (1987) views, one would expect people with hysterical trait clusterings to want to increase stimulation and thereby, experience emotion strongly. However, this runs counter to theoretical notions of emotion in individuals with hysterical traits as not being deeply felt or experienced, though strongly

The preceding examples are meant to demonstrate the rich potential applicability of temperament research to better defining and understanding hysterical trait clusterings. Such a line of research could be fruitful and deserves more in-depth study. However, a major impediment to such an undertaking is the lack of a suitable measure for hysterical trait clusterings. This basic, fundamental issue needs to be settled before a temperament-hysterical trait clustering research program can be developed.

The next section overviews various measures of hysterical trait clusterings. All are limited to some extent. However, the most promising measure appears to be the LKA's (Lazare et al.'s 1966, 1970) Hysterical factor, the LKA-H. Therefore, the literature on the LKA-H's psychometric properties and construct validity will be given special attention.

Measurement of Hysterical Trait Clusterings

This section will present an overview of presently available self-report measures of hysterical trait
clusterings. Though a number of different measures exist to assess these trait clusterings, all are weak in some way, and further work needs to be done to improve them; there is no widely accepted measure (Pollak, 1981).

As discussed earlier, criteria may be delineated in order to evaluate any given test's adequacy as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. First, psychometric data focused on reliability and construct validity must have accrued. Thus, it is important to assess a measure's technical soundness, as well as its ability to measure the characteristics it is intended to measure. The next, related criteria is that the test should measure the range of components of hysterical trait clusterings, not only a single piece (e.g., only extraversion or egocentricity). Third, a good measure of hysterical trait clusterings would combine psychometric strength with the theoretical richness of the psychoanalytic and psychodynamic perspectives. These theoretical viewpoints have exerted a strong influence on the theoretical/clinical notions of hysterical trait clusterings. Finally, the test should have applicability to both the normal and the abnormal ends of the hysterical trait clustering continuum. Items should not extensively pull for psychopathology.
A critical overview of the various self-report measures of hysterical trait clusterings is first presented. Though all measures are limited, Lazare et al.'s (1966, 1970) test appears to exhibit the most promise in terms of the above four criteria. The overview is followed by a more detailed review of the LKA-H literature.

**Current Measures**

The MMPI's scale 3, Hysteria, has often been thought of as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. It is composed of 60 True-False items which generally fall into two broad categories, somatic complaints and extreme social facility (seen as indicative of denial of interpersonal difficulties) (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960; Graham, 1977; McKinley & Hathaway, 1944/1980; Webb & McNamara, 1979).

The tenability of the MMPI's scale 3 as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings is questionable. With regard to the criteria delineated above, scale 3 has been found to be less stable over time than other MMPI clinical scales (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960). Hence, it does not appear to be measuring a stable trait pattern. In addition, scale 3's construct validity as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings is open to question on
two grounds. First, as noted previously, the scale's items fall into two broad categories. The second category, extreme social facility, appears to tap only a single component of hysterical trait clusterings, not the range of components considered to make up this trait constellation. Thus, scale 3 is limited in its definitional scope. Second, Harris and Lingoes (1955, 1968) rationally grouped scale 3 items into five subgroups. Three of these, Hyl (Denial of Social Anxiety), Hy2 (Need for Affection), and Hy5 (Inhibition of Aggression), could possibly form a hysterical trait clustering. However, scale intercorrelation data (sample size and significance levels not reported) suggest that the three do not substantially relate to one another. Graham (1977) indicated that Hyl correlated .28 with Hy2 and .25 with Hy5, while Hy2 correlated .36 with Hy5 (Harris & Lingoes, 1968). Graham (1977) additionally noted that Harris and Lingoes (1968) had also correlated these subscales with total Hysteria (H) scale scores. The following relationships were found: H-Hyl, .25; H-Hy2, .31; and H-Hy5, .38. It would appear, then, that the possible hysterical trait clustering components measured by scale 3 do not relate highly to the total scale 3 score. Thus, the total
scale 3 score can not be taken to meaningfully measure hysterical trait clusterings. Pollak (1981) believed that it was more accurate to characterize the scale as a measure of degree of resemblance to patients with conversion reactions.

Regarding the remaining criteria, MMPI scale 3 items were empirically derived. Hence, they were not theoretically-grounded in the psychoanalytic and psychodynamic viewpoints. Finally, the MMPI is oriented towards psychiatric symptomatology. It was developed for "detecting and evaluating typical and commonly recognized forms of major psychological abnormality" (McKinley & Hathaway, 1944/1980, p. 43). In the case of scale 3, items were chosen which differentiated a criterion group of patients thought to have conversion symptoms from a group of general normals (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960; McKinley & Hathaway, 1944/1980). Thus, the MMPI's clinical scales are "not designed to be sensitive to personality variables in the normal range" (Skinner, 1979, p. 276). Overall, the MMPI's scale 3 does not appear to provide a satisfactory measure of hysterical trait clusterings.

The Hysteroid-Obsessoid Questionnaire (HOQ; Caine & Hawkins, 1963; Foulds, Caine, Adams, & Owen, 1965) is
perhaps the most widely used and best-known hysterical trait clustering measure (Pollak, 1981). According to Caine and Hawkins (1963), the HOQ attempts to operationalize Janet's view of an obsessive/hysterical dichotomy that ranges along a single dimension. The test is composed of 48 items that measure 11 traits. The total score is the sum of the weighted item responses and scoring is in the hysteroid direction.

Regarding the criteria discussed earlier, test reviewers have noted a lack of evidence addressing internal consistency, although test-retest reliability appeared satisfactory (Eysenck, 1972; Lorr, 1972). Lorr (1972) noted too that response sets had not been assessed and that the test's applications are not clear. However, perhaps the most damaging criticism concerns construct validity. Several studies (Barrett, Caldbeck-Meenan, & White, 1966; Caine & Hawkins, 1963; Caine & Hope, 1967; Forbes, 1969; Foulds et al., 1965) have demonstrated high correlations (.60s to .80s) between HOQ scores and measures of Eysenck's Extraversion dimension (Pollak, 1981). These correlations led both Eysenck (1972) and Lorr (1972) to question the HOQ's construct validity and to conclude that it was another Extraversion measure. Theoretically, extraversion is
expected to be a component of hysterical trait clusterings. However, it would not be their totality. Conceivably, a person could be extraverted without necessarily sharing other aspects of a histrionic personality style, such as a global, repressive cognitive orientation. Another damaging assessment was that "the HOQ is clearly unable to distinguish psychiatrically diagnosed 'hysterics' and 'obsessionals'" (Eysenck, 1972, p. 187). HOQ items were not grounded in psychoanalytic and psychodynamic perspectives. However, item content appears applicable to normal as well as abnormal groups.

The Middlesex Hospital Questionnaire’s (MHQ; Crown & Crisp, 1970. Later republished as the Crown-Crisp Experiential Index [CCEI] with the same items) Hysteria subscale has been considered to measure hysterical trait clusterings. The MHQ is a 48-item test consisting of six subscales of eight items each. It was designed as a quick, rough screening device for clinical populations. Its Hysteria subscale purportedly measures personality traits thought to underlie hysterical symptom formation (Pollak, 1981).

While reliability of the MHQ’s individual subscales was generally considered adequate (Clark, 1972; Devito, 1985; Eysenck, 1978; Libo, 1978), evidence
was found to be lacking for the subscales' validities (Devito, 1985; Libo, 1978; Payne, 1985). Indeed, the MHQ’s total score seems to be its greatest asset, with this score generally thought to be a good, quick neuroticism measure (Devito, 1985; Eysenck, 1978; Libo, 1978). As with the HOQ, several reviewers noted the Hysteria subscale’s correlations with Eysenck’s Extraversion dimension (Eysenck, 1978; Payne, 1985; Pollak, 1981), leading Payne (1985) to suggest that the scale be relabeled. Thus, again, the items may be measuring only a part of hysterical trait clusterings rather than the presumed range of traits. The MHQ’s brevity, viewed as a strength by some reviewers (Devito, 1985; Libo, 1978), similarly appears to limit its adequacy as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. Since the Hysteria subscale is composed of only eight items, it is unlikely that the items could adequately sample the range of components comprising hysterical trait clusterings. MHQ items were not theoretically-based, but rather, were developed based on the authors’ clinical experience (Crown & Crisp, 1966). Finally, the MHQ is specifically designed for use with clinical populations.

The Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1977) is based on Millon’s (1969) theory of
psychopathology. Its Gregarious-Histrionic (GH) scale is one of eight MCMI scales which describe basic personality styles. This scale is composed of 30 True-False items designed to tap such features as fickle affectivity, sociable self-image, interpersonal seductiveness, cognitive dissociation, and immature stimulus-seeking (Millon, 1977). Reliability and validity indices have been viewed as very adequate (Hess, 1985). In addition, the MCMI's GH scale also appears to tap a range of plausible components of hysterical trait clusterings. However, as a measure of Millon's (1969) model of psychopathology, MCMI items are not clearly based in psychoanalytic and psychodynamic viewpoints. Although the MCMI GH scale has much to recommend it, its major limitation is that the test is psychopathology-oriented and that "Positive aspects of personality are absent" (Hess, 1985, p. 985). As such, the MCMI is likely of questionable relevance in use with a normal population.

Other, more recent measures do not provide sufficient evidence at this point to recommend any of them strongly. Magaro (1986; Magaro & Smith, 1981) constructed the Multivariate Personality Inventory (MPI), which includes a 12-item Hysteric subscale. Items are endorsed on a scale of one (applies very
little) to five (applies very much). Internal consistency and test-retest stability coefficients provided by Magaro (1986) for the Hysteric subscale seemed adequate. However, several of the correlations presented by Magaro (1986) called into question the subscale's construct validity. For example, MPI Hysteric scores correlated only .05 (not significant) with Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) Extraversion scores, while they correlated .54 (significant) with EPQ Neuroticism (Magaro, 1986). In addition, when Magaro (1986) intercorrelated the MPI subscales, the Hysteric scores correlated .45 with the MPI Manic subscale and .44 with the MPI Schizophrenic subscale. One would not expect essentially the same correlation between a hysterical trait clustering measure and these two subscales. Finally, the MPI Hysteric subscale correlated .06 (not significant) with the MCMI GH scale, a significant .33 with the MCMI Dependent scale, and a significant -.18 with the MCMI Antisocial scale. Thus, the subscale's construct validity is not clear.

Inspection of the MPI Hysteric subscale items (see Magaro, 1986) revealed that they tend to tap dependency-themed content, with some inclusion of cognitive style descriptions. Thus, the subscale items do not appear to
tap the range of hysterical trait clustering components. Test items appear to have been influenced to some extent by a psychodynamic perspective. Finally, the test was designed for use with normal and clinical populations "when one is considering diagnosing Axis II dimensions of DSM III" (Magaro, 1986, p. 48).

Another recent measure is the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire (PDQ; Hyler, Rieder, Spitzer, & Williams, 1982). This True-False test is designed to measure DSM-III Axis II personality disorders. As such, the Histrionic subscale reflects the DSM-III diagnostic criteria. The PDQ does not appear to have generated sufficient data to merit support as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. However, low test-retest reliability (.30) over a one-month period for the Histrionic subscale (Hurt, Hyler, Frances, Clarkin, & Brent, 1984) did not indicate a trait measure. Data regarding construct validity do not appear to be available. Since the items are based on DSM-III diagnostic criteria, the test is not strongly grounded in psychoanalytic and psychodynamic viewpoints. Finally, the test is meant to diagnose character disorders according to DSM-III criteria. As such, it is not suited for use with normal groups.
The Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory's (LKA; Lazare et al., 1966, 1970) Hysterical factor (LKA-H) has been considered the "most noteworthy" (Pollak, 1981) attempt to empirically validate a hysterical trait clustering. Pollak (1981) believed that the test offered the "best statistical evidence to date" of a clustering of hysterical traits that was consistent with theory. The LKA is a 139-item, True-False test composed of 20 personality trait subscales of seven items each. Scores on these 20 trait subscales were subsequently factor analyzed to form Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical patterns; the goal was to statistically validate these psychoanalytic personality patterns.

In terms of the criteria laid out earlier, Hill (1976) and Kline and Storey (1977) have criticized the LKA studies for their meager investigation of reliability and validity. Hill (1976) also thought there should have been an attempt to examine response sets or styles. However, the LKA and its Hysterical factor have exhibited satisfactory, though limited, evidence of reliability and construct validity (discussed in greater detail in the next section). In addition, more than any of the prior measures, the LKA-H taps various components of hysterical trait clusterings,
not just a single "piece" of them (e.g., extraversion). This means that the LKA-H offers the opportunity to explore different dimensions of hysterical trait clusterings, since it is assessing a number of traits that correlate together. Third, the LKA is based in psychoanalytic theory, the ground from which theoretical/clinical notions of hysterical trait clusterings grew. And finally, item content seems to lend itself to use with normal and abnormal groups, since items do not strongly pull for psychopathology. Based on the criteria delineated earlier, the LKA-H exhibits the most promise of the various measures discussed here. Hence, it is deserving of further study.

In summary, all of the tests available for measuring hysterical trait clusterings have limitations. In general, reliability and/or validity data, to varying degrees, are insufficient to strongly recommend any given test as a suitable measure of hysterical trait clusterings. Many tests measure simply a component of hysterical trait clusterings rather than the presumed range of traits that make up this clustering. In addition, most tests are not well-grounded in psychoanalytic and psychodynamic perspectives. And
finally, many tests are limited in their applicability to both normal and abnormal groups. However, of the tests discussed, Lazare et al's (1966, 1970) LKA-H provides the best "fit" with the criteria delineated earlier. As such, the LKA-H is the most strongly supported and potentially useful measure and so, is deserving of further study.

In the next section, the literature surrounding the LKA-H's reliability, factor replicability, and construct validity is reviewed in greater detail. Though the data are unsystematic and, in some respects, minimal, they are nevertheless positive in supporting the promise of the LKA-H as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings.

The LKA and Its Hysterical Factor

The literature regarding the LKA and the LKA-H's reliability, factor replicability, and construct validity are examined here.

Reliability. Data on reliability have been sparse and unsystematic, though what has been available supports the LKA's continued use. The internal consistency of the 20 personality trait subscales was examined by Torgersen (1980a), using a modified version of the LKA. He reported that the lowest values of
Cronbach's alpha were for Imagination (.41) (an added scale) and Severe Superego (.42). Alphas ranged from .64 to .83 for the rest of the subscales, with most of them around .75 (Torgersen, 1980a). He believed that since the (revised) subscales had only eight items each, the alphas were acceptable (Torgersen, 1980a). In a related vein, Lazare et al. (1970) reported item-to-trait correlations for each item in the 20 personality trait subscales. The researchers indicated that "only 20 percent of the final 140 items had item-to-trait correlations of less than .50" (p. 277). However, the correlations were not corrected for the individual item's contribution to the total subscale. Thus, their correlations were biased upwards. Van den Berg and Helstone (1975) noted that their item-to-trait correlations were, overall, comparable to those reported by Lazare et al. (1970). However, they did not report whether their correlations were corrected or not.

Split-half reliability coefficients for the 20 personality trait subscales, corrected for test length, were also reported by van den Berg and Helstone (1975). These ranged from .56 (Egocentricity) to .78 (Perseverance), with most in the .60s or .70s. They believed these correlations to be of sufficient
magnitude for seven-item subscales (van den Berg & Helstone, 1975). Test-retest stability of the Hysterical pattern was assessed by Hirschfeld and Klerman (1979). A correlation of .65 was obtained after a two-year interval. In addition, a t-test indicated that means did not change significantly (Hirschfeld & Klerman, 1979). Thus, Hirschfeld and Klerman (1979) concluded that the measure was stable over time. However, these findings should be viewed with some caution, since their results were based on a sample of only 15 subjects.

The above results, while supportive, are obviously quite limited. Additional estimates of reliability, particularly internal consistency and temporal stability, are strongly needed for both normal and abnormal samples.

Factor replicability. Some of the strongest support for the LKA and its Hysterical factor comes from the striking replicability of its factor structure. Table 1 summarizes the information to be presented here.

The LKA is a 139-item, True-False questionnaire scored for 20 personality trait subscales of seven items each. Scores from these personality trait subscales have subsequently been factor analyzed to form three
### Table 1

**Summary of LKA Factor Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Agg</th>
<th>Dep</th>
<th>Ego</th>
<th>EmoC</th>
<th>EmoE&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Emot</th>
<th>Exh</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>OAg</th>
<th>SxP</th>
<th>Soc&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazare et al. (1966)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazare et al. (1970)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paykel &amp; Prusoff (1973)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F+M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van den Berg &amp; Helstone (1975)</td>
<td>C+N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgersen (1980a)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F+M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgersen (1980b)</td>
<td>C+N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgersen (1980b)</td>
<td>C+N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C=Clinical; N=Normal; C+N=Clinical and Normal; F=Female; M=Male; F+M=Female and Male; Agg=Aggression; Dep=Dependence; Ego=EGocentricity; EmoC=Emotional Constriction; EmoE=Emotional Expressiveness; Emot=Emotionality; Exh=Exhibitionism; Obs=Obstinacy; OAg=Oral Agression; SxP=Sexual Provocativeness; Soc=Sociability.

<sup>a</sup>New scale added to a revised form of the LKA.
patterns of personality from psychoanalytic theory, oral, obsessive, and hysterical. In the initial study (Lazare et al., 1966), 90 female in- and outpatients were tested. Patient diagnoses included affective disorder, personality disorder, and schizophrenic disorder. The Hysterical factor was composed of a clustering of the following trait subscales (with their respective factor loadings): Aggression (.70), Emotionality (.64), Oral Aggression (.61), Exhibitionism (.59), Egocentricity (.58), Sexual Provocativeness (.57), Dependence (.40), and Emotional Constriction (-.61); the authors considered this last subscale as equivalent to emotionality and thus, did not consider it to be a Hysterical trait. A subsequent factor analysis (Lazare et al., 1970) employed data from 100 female inpatients (again, a mixed diagnosis sample) and obtained similar factor loadings ($r = .93$ by rank-order correlation between the two factors): Aggression (.68), Emotionality (.67), Oral Aggression (.66), Obstination (.64), Exhibitionism (.53), and Egocentricity (.50).

Paykel and Prusoff (1973) sampled 131 male and female depressed in- and outpatients. They obtained a Hysterical factor with loadings on Oral Aggression, Aggression, Sexual Provocativeness, Obstination,
Exhibitionism, and Emotionality (factor loadings were not cited). Using a mixed sample of 212 Dutch female psychiatric in- and outpatients and normals, as well as a Dutch translation of the LKA (including a different response format), van den Berg and Helstone (1975) obtained a Hysterical factor composed of Oral Aggression (.74), Aggression (.72), Exhibitionism (.69), Sexual Provocativeness (.63), Egocentricity (.60), and Emotionality (.47).

Additional factor analytic findings are available. Torgersen (1980a) factor analyzed a modified version of the LKA. His goal was to examine the inheritance of the modified LKA's factors in a clinical population. Subjects were male and female same-sexed twins who had been treated for neurotic or borderline disorders on an inpatient or outpatient basis. The modified LKA was composed of 17 subscales of eight items each. Scores on the 17 subscales were factor analyzed and an "Impulsive Hysteric" factor was obtained. Factor loading criteria were not specified in the report, but the following subscales had a loading of greater than .50: Oral Aggression (.62), Exhibitionism (.57), Sociability (.53), Aggression (.51), and Emotional Expressiveness (.51).
Torgersen (1980b) studied hereditary and environmental factors in different personality traits. As part of the study, he translated the LKA into Norwegian and added three new scales, Lack of Self-esteem, Introversion, and Eridophobia (fear of aggression, sickness, and disasters). He obtained Hysterical factors based on data from mixed normal and neurotic samples of 98 female twins and 100 male twins. For females, the Hysterical factor was composed of Aggression (.82), Oral Aggression (.76), Emotionality (.74), Exhibitionism (.70), Egocentricity (.64), Emotional Constriction (-.63), Obstinacy (.60), and Sexual Provocativeness (.58). For males, the Hysterical factor was composed of the following: Aggression (.81), Obstinacy (.59), and Emotionality (.52).

Finally, Smith et al. (1983) factor analyzed LKA scores from 100 American undergraduate females. Their Hysterical factor obtained a rank-order correlation of .69 when compared with Lazare et al.'s (1966) original factor. However, the personality traits and their factor loadings were not cited.

Taken together, the original results and the subsequent replications, cutting across various samples and cultures as they do, strongly support the
replicability of the LKA's factor structure and the composition of the Hysterical factor. However, most studies have used samples of patients or a mixture of patients and normals. Thus, little is known about the LKA's factor structure and the traits that load on it when testing a normal population.

**Construct validity.** Construct validational support, suggesting that the LKA-H measures hysterical trait clusterings, may be obtained from the results of several studies. However, none of these investigations was focused on assessing the LKA-H's construct validity. Rather, findings were presented that bear on this topic.

Hirschfeld and Klerman (1979) factor analyzed the LKA scores and the scores from other personality inventories of 119 depressed male and female inpatients. The LKA-H factor loaded on a factor labeled "general sociability and suggestibility", with a factor loading of .794 (Hirschfeld & Klerman, 1979). Smith et al. (1983) factor analyzed LKA factor scores and scores from the Hysteric, Compulsive, and Character Disorder subscales of their Multivariate Personality Inventory (Magaro, 1986; Magaro & Smith, 1981). Scores were obtained from 100 college females. The LKA-H and their Hysteric subscale both loaded highly on the same factor (respectively, .7185 and .8002).
Other construct validational evidence has also been demonstrated. Paykel and Prusoff (1973) tested depressed patients and reported a significant correlation of .39 between self-reported LKA-H scores and scores on Eysenck's (1959) Maudsley Personality Inventory Extraversion scale. Though Pollak (1981) noted this as a criticism, a correlation of this magnitude would be expected and, in fact, offers support for the LKA-H's construct validity. In addition, a significant correlation of .25 was obtained between LKA-H scores derived from an interview with a close relative of the patient and self-reported Extraversion scores (Paykel & Prusoff, 1973). Paykel, Prusoff, Klerman, and DiMascio (1973) studied depressed patients and examined discrepancies between patients' self-report of and clinicians' assessment of symptoms. LKA scores were obtained and the researchers concluded that "consistent with a rather common psychiatric belief...exaggerating tendencies may be found among hysterical and oral dependent persons and some neurotics" (p. 173). Torgersen (1980c) investigated personality and experience in an encounter group, using his revised version of the LKA (Torgersen, 1980a). While no significant correlations were obtained between
LKA-H scores and scores on a post-group evaluation questionnaire, one such correlation (−.47) was significant at the .10 level and suggested that the higher the LKA-H score, the more the student disagreed with having felt any dysphoric emotion after the group. This may be viewed as suggestive of a repressive process.

In an examination of character and defense, von der Lippe and Torgersen (1984) tested pregnant women and their mothers, using Torgersen's (1980a) revised LKA (here referred to as the Basic Character Inventory, or BCI) and Kragh's (1960) Defense Mechanisms Test. They found a "marginal" relationship between BCI Hysterical scores and the use of repression, $r = .23$, $p < .10$, (von der Lippe & Torgersen, 1984). A strong relationship ($r = .47$, $p < .01$) between hysterical traits and the defense of introjection of the opposite-sex role was also obtained (von der Lippe & Torgersen, 1984). A theoretical explanation for this finding was advanced by the researchers. That is, theoretically, hysterical trait clusterings result from sexual identification conflicts during the phallic phase of development, with subsequent unclear gender identification. Von der Lippe and Torgersen (1984) also indicated that BCI Hysterical
scores correlated significantly with the California Psychological Inventory scales of Sociability, Dominance, Self-Acceptance, and Capacity for Status in a sample of Norwegian medical students.

Benjaminsen, Jorgensen, Kragh-Hansen, and Pedersen (1984) studied the relationships between memories of parental child-rearing practices and adult personality features in 200 normal Danish subjects. They reported numerous significant correlations between LKA-H scores in females and memories of their fathers. The researchers felt that the results indicated a more complex relationship between the fathers and the hysterical traits of their daughters. Benjaminsen et al. (1984) further speculated that this was suggestive of a fixation in the Oedipal stage of development, consistent with psychoanalytic theory.

Taken as a whole, the above body of research is supportive of the construct validity of the LKA-H. However, it would be beneficial to directly focus research on the LKA-H's construct validity.

Conclusions. In summary, the evidence cited above supports the further study of the LKA and its Hysterical factor. Adequate, though very limited, data have been published regarding internal consistency, split-half
reliability, and test-retest reliability. Clearly, more information regarding reliability is needed. In addition, the LKA factors have been replicated among different samples and cultures. However, most samples have been composed of either psychiatric patients or a combination of psychiatric patients and normals. It would be of interest, then, to examine the LKA’s factor structure with a normal sample. Finally, a review of a number of studies which employed the LKA is suggestive of the LKA-H’s construct validity. However, none of these studies was meant to be a direct examination of the LKA’s or the LKA-H’s construct validity. Given the piecemeal fashion of the above results, but also considering the support they offer, it would potentially be beneficial to focus a study on these issues. The present investigation, then, aims to provide further information on the reliability, factor replicability, and construct validity of the LKA-H with a normal sample. In addition, the potential practical utility of the LKA-H is further examined.

Integration and Hypotheses

Several measures of hysterical trait clusterings are available, all of them limited in some way.
However, the measure that appears to exhibit the most promise is the Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory's (Lazare et al., 1966, 1970) Hysterical factor, the LKA-H. The LKA-H best meets the criteria, delineated earlier, for an adequate hysterical trait clustering measure and so, deserves further study. Since much of the research with the factor has been done with clinical samples, the current study examined the test's consistency of measurement, factor replicability, construct validity, and practical utility with normal college students.

There are two reasons for focusing on hysterical trait clusterings and, in particular, the normal end of the continuum, the histrionic personality style. The first is of theoretical interest. Many theoreticians and researchers assume that histrionic personality style is essentially a paler version of hysterical character disorder. While this seems a reasonable assumption, there is no research that examines differences between the two ends of the presumed hysterical trait clustering continuum. It may be that the two differ in terms of personality components or in temperamental underpinnings. The second reason is of applied interest. Hysterical trait clustering constructs are
used in both clinical and nonclinical realms and will, in all likelihood, continue to be employed. Therefore, it would be beneficial to better understand these constructs, their defining features, and their etiological underpinnings more fully. Such findings could have implications for practitioners in clinical and nonclinical (e.g., medical, academic, and vocational) settings. Therefore, for these two reasons, one theoretical and one practical, it would be of interest to focus on the normal end of the hysterical trait clustering continuum, the histrionic personality style.

Three research questions will be of interest in the current study. These are presented below, along with the specific issues to be addressed under each question and the hypotheses made.

First Research Question: Consistency of Measurement and Factor Replicability

The first research question focuses on the LKA's consistency of measurement and factor replicability when the test is used with a normal sample.

Research has indicated satisfactory, though limited, evidence of internal consistency when the LKA has been used with clinical samples (Lazare et al.,
1970; Torgersen, 1980a) and with a mixed sample of patients and normals (van den Berg & Helstone, 1975). It remains to be seen, however, whether internal consistency remains satisfactory when the test is employed with a sample of normals. To test this, internal consistency estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) of college students’ responses to the 20 LKA personality trait subscales will be computed. Adequate coefficient alphas (Cronbach’s alpha ≥ .70) are predicted for the 20 subscales.

Another issue that bears further investigation relates to the LKA’s factor structure with a normal sample. The LKA’s factor structure has been replicated with clinical (Lazare et al., 1966, 1970; Paykel & Prusoff, 1973; Torgersen, 1980a) and mixed clinical and normal samples (Torgersen, 1980b; van den Berg & Helstone, 1975). Only one study employed solely normal subjects (Smith et al., 1983). Smith et al. (1983) indicated that they replicated the earlier research’s factor structure, but factor loadings were not cited. Hence, the present study examined the factor structure of the LKA with a normal population sample. College students’ LKA personality trait subscale scores were factor analyzed in an attempt to replicate the factor
structure found in previous research. The three factors found in prior studies (corresponding to Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical clusterings) are predicted to replicate in the current study. The factor of interest here will be the Hysterical factor.

The final issue to be examined here regards the LKA-H's temporal consistency with a normal sample. The LKA-H's test-retest reliability has been examined in only one study (Hirschfeld & Klerman, 1979). They used a clinical sample and found evidence to support temporal stability over a two-year period. Clearly, more information needs to be gathered regarding test-retest reliability in general and with normal subjects in particular. Thus, the LKA's and the LKA-H's temporal consistency with a normal sample was evaluated in the current study.

The LKA was administered to college students on two occasions, with a one-month interval between administrations, in order to examine test-retest reliability. Coefficients of stability were computed and subscale means compared for the 20 LKA personality trait subscales. High, positive correlations are hypothesized for the subscales, since they are meant to measure stable traits. In addition, it is predicted
that means do not significantly differ.

In addition, a Hysterical scale was derived by combining the subscale scores of the personality trait subscales that load on the Hysterical factor. For example, suppose that the Emotionality, Oral Aggression, and Exhibitionism subscales load on and define the Hysterical factor. The scores of these three subscales were then added together to form a score for a Hysterical scale. This Hysterical scale score was computed twice for the subjects who completed the LKA on two occasions. The two Hysterical scale scores were then correlated in order to investigate the temporal stability of the total Hysterical scale scores. A high, positive correlation is predicted, since the scale score supposedly reflects a stable trait clustering. Hysterical scale means from the two administrations were also compared. It is hypothesized that means do not significantly differ.

Second Research Question: Construct Validity

The second research question in the current study will concern the validity of the LKA-H factor. Specifically, an attempt was made to evaluate the LKA-H's construct validity with a normal sample. The issue here is whether the LKA-H relates to components of
personality it "should" be relating to, based on theory and/or research. Both convergent and discriminant construct validity were examined by correlating LKA-H factor scores with scores on relevant personality measures. These are discussed in greater detail below.

LKA-H and field dependence. The relationship between LKA-H factor scores and field dependence was evaluated since a relationship has been demonstrated in the research cited earlier. Several studies (Fogliani Messina et al., 1982/1983; Lawrence & Morton, 1974; Magaro & Smith, 1982; Miller & Magaro, 1977; Morris & Shapiro, 1974; Smith et al., 1983; Zuckmann, 1957) have indicated a relationship between hysterical trait clusterings and field dependence. This association is also reasonable from a theoretical perspective. Field dependence refers to the tendency to rely on the external field as a reference point, rather than on information from within oneself. Such an external orientation is compatible with hysterical trait clusterings. Moreover, field dependent individuals have exhibited a global cognitive style (Witkin, Goodenough, & Oltman, 1979), a relative lack of internal psychological articulation (Witkin et al., 1979), the use of less specialized, more global defenses such as
repression and denial (Witkin et al., 1971; Witkin et al., 1979), fewer structured controls over affective expression (Witkin et al., 1979), and a greater social orientation and enhanced interpersonal competence (Witkin & Goodenough, 1977, 1981). These characteristics suggest similarities to hysterical trait clusterings. The measure of field dependence in this study is the Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT; Witkin et al., 1971), which is scored in the field independent direction. Therefore, a negative correlation of moderate magnitude, reflecting convergent construct validity, is predicted between LKA-H factor scores and GEFT scores.

**LKA-H and extraversion.** Extraversion has garnered research and theoretical support as a variable that would plausibly relate to a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. Several studies have demonstrated just such a relationship (Bagley, 1980; Barrett et al., 1966; Caine & Hope, 1964; Forbes, 1969; Foulds et al., 1965; Ingham & Robinson, 1964; Paykel & Prusoff, 1973; Young et al., 1971). Extraversion, indicative of sociability and outgoingness, can easily be viewed theoretically as relating to hysterical trait clusterings. The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975)
was utilized here to measure extraversion. As evidence suggestive of convergent construct validity, it is hypothesized that LKA-H factor scores correlate significantly, moderately, and positively with EPQ Extraversion scores. No significant relationship is predicted between the LKA-H and EPQ Neuroticism. While there is an emotional expressiveness component to histrionic personality style, the EPQ’s Neuroticism scale taps a dimension of worrying, tension, and anxiety. Such a dimension would not be a part of histrionic personality style, particularly with a normal sample. This hypothesis, of no relationship, reflects discriminant construct validity. Predictions of no significant relationship between LKA-H factor scores and scores on the other EPQ scales (Psychoticism and Lie) are also made. These, too, suggest discriminant construct validity.

LKA-H and defense mechanisms. Repressive defensive processes in hysterical trait clusterings have been discussed theoretically (Schafer, 1954; Shapiro, 1965) and absorbed into clinical lore. Researchers have also found support for this association (Blinder, 1966; Jordan & Kempler, 1970; Miller & Magaro, 1977; O’Neill & Kempler, 1969; Torgersen, 1980c; von der Lippe & Torgersen, 1984).
In the current study, the Defense Mechanisms Inventory (DMI; Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986) was used to measure the tendency to employ repressive defenses. A significant, high, positive correlation reflecting convergent construct validity is hypothesized between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Reversal (repression, denial) scores. In a similar vein, a significant positive correlation of lesser magnitude is predicted between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Turning Against Object (identification-with-the-aggressor, displacement) scores. Again, this would be indicative of convergent construct validity.

These two hypotheses regarding Reversal and Turning Against Object might be viewed as mutually exclusive, since Reversal broadly refers to an internalizing of negative affect and Turning Against Object, an externalizing (Cramer, 1988). However, for people with a histrionic personality style, their primary response to a stressor or conflict would be a repressing, denying one. However, it seems that Turning Against (the external) Object would be likely as a secondary response, given their external orientation, lack of reflectiveness, and greater likelihood to turn against the external environment than within themselves.
This primary-secondary status is reflected in the hypotheses, in that Reversal is expected to correlate more highly with the LKA-H factor than Turning Against Object. However, both should be positive correlations.

A significant, high, negative correlation between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Principalization (intellectualization, rationalization, isolation), suggesting convergent construct validity, is also expected, since individuals with hysterical trait clusterings would be especially unlikely to engage in such cognitive defensive maneuvers. A prediction of no significant relation between LKA-H factor scores and scores on the DMI’s Turning Against Self scale is made, indicative of discriminant construct validity.

LKA-H and social desirability. The relationship between LKA-H factor scores and the response style variable of social desirability was assessed. Research on an association between hysterical trait clusterings and social desirability has been neither extensive nor conclusive (Miller & Magaro, 1981; Magaro, 1986). Theoretically, however, it is possible to see links between the two. Social desirability has been considered as a motivational variable, a characteristic of the test-taker. It has come to be defined as a need
for approval from others, obtained in a culturally accepted and appropriate manner (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Marlowe & Crowne, 1961). Such a need is consistent with descriptions of people with hysterical trait clusterings. For them, others' opinions of them are very important. They tend to have an egocentric orientation, as well as an overall desire to look good to others. Social desirability allows for an assessment of this response style in the LKA-H items. However, it also potentially demonstrates a theoretically meaningful relation that would reflect convergent construct validity. Social desirability was measured by Reynold's (1982) short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SF; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). LKA-H factor scores are predicted to correlate significantly and positively with MC-SF scores.

It will be recalled that a hypothesis of no relation was made between the LKA-H factor and the EPQ Lie scale. Since the MC-SF and the EPQ Lie scale might be viewed as similar, it may be puzzling why a hypothesis of a positive relationship between LKA-H factor scores and MC-SF scores was made, while a hypothesis of no relationship was made for LKA-H factor scores and EPQ Lie scale scores. The EPQ Lie scale is
viewed here primarily as a dissimulation index. That is, it is an indicator of an attempt by a person to "hide" something and "fake good" test results. MC-SF, on the other hand, is viewed as an attitudinal variable representing a value on presenting oneself in a positive light. Thus, the MC-SF differs from the EPQ Lie scale in that the latter is designed to pick up efforts to hide something, while the MC-SF lacks this consciously manipulative intent.

**Third Research Question: Two-Point Code Configurations**

The third research question will deal with potential applied uses of the LKA-H. Specifically, the study examines the use of two-point code configurations, similar to the MMPI, to explore possible subtypes of histrionic personality style in a normal sample. No hypotheses are made for this part of the study; since this is an exploratory undertaking, it is not possible to predict possible outcomes. Whether the subtypes can be formed depends on how the data come out and it is not yet possible to have a sense of this.

In this portion of the study, subjects whose LKA-H factor scores are in the upper one-third of the LKA-H factor score distribution were sorted out. This group constitutes the Histrionic Personality Style (HPS) group.
Within the HPS group, the two highest LKA-H personality trait subscales on which each subject scored was determined. HPS subjects were then divided into subgroups, based on the two personality trait subscales on which they scored the highest. These subjects are considered to represent various subtypes of histrionic personality style. For example, suppose that the LKA-H factor was composed of loadings on the LKA's Aggression, Oral Aggression, Emotionality, Exhibitionism, and Dependence personality trait subscales. HPS subjects would be divided into subgroups based on which two of these five subscales they scored the highest. Thus, there might be several subjects who scored highest on Emotionality and Aggression; they would form the Emotionality-Aggression subgroup. Likewise, subjects highest on Exhibitionism and Dependence would be sorted into their own subgroup. A subject who scores highest on, for instance, Exhibitionism and second highest on Dependence would be in the same subgroup as a subject who scored highest on Dependence and second highest on Exhibitionism (again, as is done with MMPI code configurations). In the event of a two-way tie for first place, that subject was included in the relevant grouping. Thus, a subject whose highest score was for
both Dependence and Exhibitionism would also be in the Dependence-Exhibitionism group. If more than two subscales tie for first place, or if there is a tie for second place, those subjects will be dropped. This was done in an effort to maintain the purity of the subtype suggested by the two-point code configuration. Cut-off scores for the individual personality trait subscales were not determined because the HPS subjects, since they are extreme scorers, are by definition already high on the relevant trait subscales.

Subjects in the various HPS subgroups were compared between themselves and the remainder of the sample. Only HPS subgroups with an adequate number of subjects were employed (e.g., 10 or more subjects). Dependent variables on which the groups were compared were the scores on the GEFT, the EPQ, the DMI, and the MC-SF.

Summary of Hypotheses

A total of 16 hypotheses were made in the current study. The following six predictions were made under the first research question, dealing with the psychometric issues of consistency (internal and temporal) and factor replicability with a normal sample:

1) Adequate internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's
alpha ≥ .70) are predicted for the 20 LKA personality trait subscales.

2) The three factors corresponding to Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical clusterings, found in previous research, are predicted to replicate.

3) High, positive, significant test-retest correlations are hypothesized for 20 LKA personality trait subscales.

4) It is also predicted that the subscales' test-retest means do not significantly differ.

5) A high, positive, significant test-retest correlation is predicted for a Hysterical scale (derived from the factor loadings on the Hysterical factor).

6) Further, it is predicted that test-retest means for this scale do not significantly differ.

The following 10 predictions were directed towards the second research question, which focused on the construct validity of the LKA-H factor:

7) A significant, negative, moderate correlation, reflecting convergent construct validity, is hypothesized between LKA-H factor scores and GEFT scores.

8) LKA-H scores are predicted to correlate significantly, moderately, and positively with EPQ Extraversion scores, suggesting convergent construct validity.
9) No significant correlation is expected between LKA-H factor scores and EPQ Neuroticism scores, suggesting discriminant construct validity.

10) It is hypothesized that there is no significant correlation between LKA-H factor scores and EPQ Psychoticism, suggesting discriminant construct validity.

11) No significant relation is expected between LKA-H factor scores and EPQ Lie scale scores, reflecting discriminant construct validity.

12) A significant, high, positive correlation is hypothesized between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Reversal scores. This would suggest convergent construct validity.

13) A significant, positive correlation of lesser magnitude is predicted between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Turning Against Object scores, reflective of convergent construct validity.

14) A significant, high, negative correlation between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Principalization scores is expected, suggesting convergent construct validity.

15) It is predicted that there is no significant relationship between LKA-H factor scores and DMI Turning Against Object scores, suggestive of discriminant construct validity.
16) LKA-H factor scores are hypothesized to correlate significantly and positively with MC-SF scores.

No hypotheses were made for the third research question, which dealt with exploratory uses of the LKA-H factor.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The study sample was composed of 94 female undergraduates recruited through the introductory psychology classes of a middle-sized, private, Midwestern university. All subjects received course incentives for their participation. Sample characteristics are summarized in Table 2. A subsample of 31 subjects was randomly selected and these subjects completed the LKA on two occasions, with a one-month interval between administrations. Only females were employed in the study in order to remain consistent with previous research.

Materials

The following measures were used in the current investigation.

Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory. A detailed review of the LKA (Lazare et al., 1966, 1970) was provided in the last chapter. Therefore, only a brief summary will be presented here. The LKA (see Appendix B) is a 139-item, True-False inventory for
Table 2

Description of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Class&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean age was 18.96 years, with a standard deviation of 1.74 years.

<sup>a</sup>Data missing for one subject.
assessing 20 personality trait subscales: Aggression, Dependence, Egocentricity, Emotionality, Emotional Constriction, Exhibitionism, Fear of Sexuality, Obstinacy, Oral Aggression, Orderliness, Parsimony, Passivity, Perseverance, Pessimism, Rejection of Others, Rigidity, Self Doubt, Sexual Provocativeness, Suggestibility, and Superego (see Appendix C for items that comprise each subscale). Scores on the 20 personality trait subscales have been factor analyzed to form psychoanalytic patterns of Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical factors. All True responses are given one point, except for item number 136 on the Orderliness subscale, which is scored if False is endorsed.

The original work on the LKA’s factor structure (Lazare et al., 1966, 1970) has been replicated in several other studies with different samples and in different cultures (Paykel & Prusoff, 1973; Smith et al., 1983; Torgersen, 1980a, 1980b; van den Berg & Helstone, 1975). Satisfactory evidence has been presented regarding internal consistency (Lazare et al., 1970; Torgersen, 1980a; van den Berg & Helstone, 1975) and temporal stability (Hirschfeld & Klerman, 1979), though the data has been limited. While no research has been published directly bearing on the LKA’s construct
validity, the results of several studies using the LKA have been highly suggestive of the LKA-H's construct validity (Benjaminsen et al., 1984; Hirschfeld & Klerman, 1979; Paykel & Prusoff, 1973; Paykel et al., 1973; Smith et al., 1983; Torgersen, 1980c; von der Lippe & Torgersen, 1984).

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) is the most recently developed measure of Eysenck's (1967; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976) personality dimensions of Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N), and Psychoticism (P). The test also has a Lie (L) scale to assess for "faking good" tendencies. The test is composed of 90 items and uses a Yes-No format. Appendix D includes the test's items arranged according to respective scale. The E scale, the most important of the EPQ scales for the purposes of the current investigation, taps a dimension of sociability. The N scale measures emotional stability, anxiety proneness, and difficulty in quickly reequilibrating after an upsetting incident. P is intended to measure a rather controversial trait of Psychoticism, which Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) suggested be thought of as "toughmindedness". This dimension seems to tap a combination of impulsiveness and sociopathy.
Eysenck and Eysenck's (1975) EPQ manual provided test-retest, alpha, and intercorrelation coefficients. Test-retest reliabilities were generally satisfactory. Coefficients of temporal stability (with the effects of age and sex removed) for a total sample of 257 males and females ranged from .78 (P) to .89 (E). Internal consistency estimates discussed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) were also satisfactory overall. For females, alpha coefficients ranged from .68 (for normals' P scores) to .88 (for prisoners' N scores). For males, alpha coefficients ranged from .71 (for prisoners' P scores) to .85 (for normals' E scores). Scale intercorrelations were computed based on the scores of 500 normal men and 500 normal women (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Three of the six intercorrelations for females were significant: E-N (-.14), N-L (-.15), and L-P -.19). Three of the six intercorrelations for males were also significant: E-N (-.16), L-P (-.23), and N-P (.12). Although the Eysencks strive for independent factors, the low intercorrelations were not viewed as seriously damaging assumptions of orthogonality between factors (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Similar findings and conclusions have been found more recently by Goh, King, and King (1982) and Loo (1979).
While reliability indices generally seem adequate, reviewers (Block, 1978; Kline, 1978; Stricker, 1978; Tellegen, 1978) consistently criticize the lack of technical data to support Eysenck and Eysenck's (1975) claims regarding scale validities. Questions were raised regarding what dimensions the L and the P scales actually measure (Block, 1978; Kline, 1978). According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1975), the P scale taps a dimension composed of aggressiveness, impulsivity, and lack of empathy. The L scale is depicted as a combination of dissimulation ("faking good") and "some stable personality factor which may possibly denote some degree of social naivete" (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975, p. 7). Recent factor analytic work suggested that, at a broad level, the P and the L scales load at opposite ends of a bipolar factor labeled "Impulsive-Unsocialized-Sensation Seeking" (Zuckerman, Kuhlman, & Camac, 1988). Thus, Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) appear to have been correct in their beliefs about the P scale. The L scale appears to be tapping, to some degree, a socialization-conformity dimension, as well as dissimulation.

All of the reviewers strongly questioned the Eysencks' contention that the EPQ E scale and the EPI
(the Eysenck Personality Inventory, the EPQ's immediate predecessor) E scale should be assumed to be equivalent -- in the absence of data to support that position. Block (1978) noted that the EPI E scale combined items regarding sociability and impulsivity, while the EPQ E scale primarily stressed sociability. He speculated that the change "was probably due to the Eysencks' strong preference for uncorrelated scales conjoined with the presence, in their emerging concept of psychoticism, of a component tantamount to impulsivity" (p. 806).

Research since then has examined the interrelationships between the EPQ E scale and the EPI E scale. Campbell and Reynolds (1982) found significant correlations between the two E scales of .81 (female students), .79 (male students), and .80 (combined sample). These are consistent with the significant correlation of .74 obtained by Rocklin and Revelle (1981) in their study of college students. Rocklin and Revelle (1981) further demonstrated that the correlation between the two E scales was due primarily to their shared sociability component: A significant correlation of .77 between the EPQ E scale and the EPI sociability subscale was obtained, while a significant correlation of .39 was found between the EPQ E scale and the EPI
impulsivity subscale. Thus, it appears that the two scales are not equivalent and that the EPQ E scale is best considered as a measure of sociability.

The EPQ was chosen for use in the current study for three reasons. First, the theoretical literature regarding hysterical trait clusterings has shown social ascendancy and outgoingness to be prominent features. Thus, the EPQ E scale provides a good measure of this sociability component. Second, past research has shown a relationship between hysterical trait clusterings and E-measured extraversion (Bagley, 1980; Barrett et al., 1966; Caine & Hope, 1964; Forbes, 1969; Foulds et al., 1965; Paykel & Prusoff, 1973; Young et al., 1971). And finally, the EPQ was chosen because it is the most current measure of those available from Eysenck and hence, reflects his most current conceptualizations.

**Group Embedded Figures Test.** The Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT; Vitkin et al., 1971) was employed as a measure of Witkin’s field dependence-independence (FDI) construct (Witkin et al., 1962; Witkin & Goodenough, 1981). The GEFT is a timed test which requires the subject to locate a simple shape within a more complex design. The first section consists of seven relatively easy tasks and is meant mainly for practice. The second and third sections are each
composed of nine items of greater difficulty. Scores are derived from performance on the final two sections and range from zero to 18. Higher scores indicate a more field independent (FI) orientation and lower scores, a more field dependent (FD) orientation.

Witkin et al. (1971) discussed indices of the test's reliability and validity. Internal consistency reliability was assessed by correlating the scores on the last two sections of the GEFT. A reliability estimate of .82 for both males and females was found. Other research has also supported the internal consistency of the test (Carter & Loo, 1980; De Sanctis & Dunikoski, 1983; Panek, Funk, & Nelson, 1980).

Witkin et al.'s (1971) validity data consisted of correlations between GEFT scores and scores on other FDI measures. Subjects were college students. Correlations between GEFT scores and scores on an individually-administered embedded figures test were -.63 for females and -.82 for males. Negative correlations were expected since the tests are scored in a reversed manner (Witkin et al., 1971). Correlations between the GEFT and absolute size of errors on a portable rod-and-frame test were -.34 for females and -.39 for males. Finally, correlations between the GEFT and the degree of body
articulation of the body concept in a human figure drawing were obtained. Females obtained a correlation of .55 and males, .71.

Reviewers of the GEFT have been divided in their criticisms. Goodstein (1978) felt that reliability and validity indices were satisfactory. However, Hall (1978) indicated that the manual's validity data were "not extensive" and that correlations, while in the expected direction, were not "impressive". He focused particularly on the correlations for females.

More recent studies have gathered data relevant to validity. Preston and King (1979) selected 12 FD undergraduates and 12 FI undergraduates (gender unspecified) and correlated their GEFT scores and scores on Nickel's (1971) portable rod-and-frame test. A significant correlation of -.72 was found. Panek et al. (1980) tested 175 female volunteers, residing in a Midwestern urban area, on the GEFT and Oltman's (1968) portable rod-and-frame test. The correlation between the two tests over all the subjects was -.46 (significant). For the 17-to-24 year-old age range, of relevance here, a significant correlation of -.52 was obtained. Taken together, the evidence appears to indicate that the GEFT shares some common variance with
other, individual measures of FDI. However, as Hall (1978) indicated, it is not clear, at least for females, that the GEFT is measuring FDI to the extent one might wish.

The GEFT was chosen for use in the present study for four reasons. First, it was considered important to assess a cognitive variable, given the emphasis placed on global cognition in the theoretical and the research literature regarding hysterical trait clusterings. The GEFT, as a measure of FDI, should assess the global cognition typically attributed to hysterical trait clusterings. Second, the research literature has demonstrated a relationship between FDI and hysterical trait clusterings (Fogliani Messina et al., 1982/1983; Lawrence & Morton, 1974; Magaro & Smith, 1982; Miller & Magaro, 1977; Morris & Shapiro, 1974; Smith et al., 1983; Zuckmann, 1957). Therefore, a purported measure of hysterical trait clusterings should show an association with an FDI measure. Third, the GEFT provides a direct sample of behavior, rather than relying on self-report. Thus, it provides information that is unique from that provided by the other, self-report measures in this study. Finally, the GEFT was chosen because it is the standard group measure of FDI,
developed by the originators of the FDI construct. As such, the test fits well with the group-testing design of the current investigation. Although there may be a lack of clarity regarding the extent of the GEFT's construct validity, the test nevertheless does appear to tap the FDI dimension. It is also noteworthy that both GEFT reviewers (Goodstein, 1978; Hall, 1978) considered the test satisfactory as a group measure for research purposes.

**Short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.** A short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), proposed by Reynolds (1982), was employed in the current study (see Appendix E). This shorter test (MC-SF) consists of 13 items drawn from the full 33-item MC SDS. The original test was developed as a measure of a person's need to present him- or herself in a socially desirable manner (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Social desirability (SD) was further refined as "a need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that this can be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors" (Marlowe & Crowne, 1961, p. 109). The original test items were chosen to reflect culturally approved behaviors that had a low probability
of occurrence and that were not psychopathology-oriented (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The above conceptualization of SD is that of a motivational characteristic of the test-taker, in contrast to Edwards' (1957) notion of SD as a characteristic of test items. Data to support reliability and validity of the full MC SDS were presented in the original research (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Marlowe & Crowne, 1961).

Reynolds (1982) indicated that the MC SDS is the most commonly used SD measure. However, many researchers fail to assess for SD because the MC SDS is as long or longer than the personality measure of central interest. Therefore, Reynolds (1982) attempted to develop reliable and valid MC SDS short-forms for research use, utilizing college students' MC SDS scores. The full scale scores were factor analyzed and the 11 items loading .40 or above on the single significant factor comprised one short form. Two additional forms, one of 12 items and one of 13 items, were created by adding extra items to the 11. Items were added to increase internal consistency reliability and were chosen based on their item-to-total-scale correlation (Reynolds, 1982). Finally, scores from three other MC SDS short forms, developed by Strahan and Gerbasi
(1972), were also included in comparisons of the internal consistency and the concurrent validity or the various short-forms.

Two of the six forms evaluated showed the best indices of internal consistency. The 13-item short-form, designated Form C, demonstrated an adequate KR-20 coefficient of .76 (compared to the full scale's KR-20 of .82). Form C's mean item-to-total-scale correlation was .38 (vs. .32 for the full scale). One of the Strahan and Gerbasi (1972) short-forms, designated Form XX, had a KR-20 coefficient of .79, but was composed of 20 items. Form XX's mean item-to-total-scale correlation was .35.

Concurrent validity was assessed by correlating scores on the short-forms with scores from the full MC SDS and the Edwards SDS. Forms C and XX significantly correlated the highest with both the MC SDS (.93 and .95, respectively) and the Edwards SDS (.41 and .43, respectively; compared to the full scale MC SDS's significant correlation with the Edwards SDS of .47). Reynolds (1982) recommended Form C as the most desirable short-form due to the minimal psychometric differences between it and Form XX, and due to its shorter length (13 vs. 20 items).
Zook and Sipps (1985) presented a cross-validation of this 13-item MC SDS. They attempted to correct shortcomings in Reynolds' (1982) study by administering the short-form separately (as opposed to computing analyses based on subsets of responses to the full scale), calculating reliabilities separately for males and females, and examining temporal reliability. Three student samples (two undergraduate and one graduate) were utilized.

Results were presented separately for each sample (divided into male and female), as well as for all three samples combined. No significant sex differences were found between mean short-form scores. Reliability data showed "few differences" due to sex (Zook & Sipps, 1985). KR-20 coefficients of internal consistency ranged from .63 (upper-level undergraduate males) to .82 (graduate females), with an overall mean coefficient of .74. Mean item-to-total-scale correlations ranged from .42 (upper-level undergraduate males) to .56 (upper-level undergraduate females); the overall mean correlation was .49. A subsample of the upper-level undergraduates retook the shortened MC SDS after a six-week interval and a temporal reliability coefficient of .74 was obtained. It was concluded that, "the short
form can be used instead of the regular form without significant loss of reliability" (Zook & Sipps, 1985, p. 237).

The MC SDS was chosen for the current investigation because it was designed to use with normal subjects and because it is a standard, commonly used measure of social desirability. The short version of this test, the MC-SF, was selected primarily due to pragmatic concerns. Since subjects completed a packet of several measures, the MC-SF was used in the interest of conserving time.

**Defense Mechanisms Inventory.** Ihilevich and Gleser's (1986; Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969) Defense Mechanisms Inventory (DMI) is a forced-choice test designed to measure the tendency to employ five categories of defenses. The categories of defense mechanisms assessed are Reversal (REV; subsumes repression, denial, negation, and reaction-formation), Principalization (PRN; includes intellectualization, rationalization, and isolation), Turning Against Object (TAO; encompasses identification-with-the-aggressor and displacement), Turning Against Self (TAS; includes autosadism and masochism), and Projection (PRO).

Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) described how the five
defense classifications were derived. In their initial studies to develop the DMI, the test's authors asked college students to write out their responses to vignettes of conflictual situations. The authors found that the responses could be best categorized by grouping them into a five-way classification system of defenses (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). In addition, the five defense styles offered the advantage of "parsimoniously encompassing most of the classical defense mechanisms" (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986, p. 18). Thus, based on this five-way classification system, responses were developed to correspond to each category of defense.

Subjects completing the DMI read 10 vignettes. (Appendix F includes the vignettes and the response alternatives.) Each story represents one of five areas of conflict (situational, authority, independence, competition, and femininity for females and masculinity for males), with two vignettes per conflict area (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). Each conflict area is included once in the first five stories and then repeated again in the next five. Following each vignette are four questions regarding what the subject's response would be. Each question refers to a level of response: how the subject would respond in actual
behavior, how she would respond in fantasy, what thought would occur to her, and how would she feel and why.

Following each of these response levels are five choices, with each choice corresponding to one of the five defense mechanism categories. The subject indicates which one of the five choices (i.e., defenses) would be most likely for her under that level of response, and which one would be least likely for her. Items endorsed as most likely receive two points, those identified as least likely receive zero points, and unmarked items receive one point each. Points for defense mechanism categories are summed across response levels and across the 10 vignettes. This yields a score for each of the five defense categories. The total possible score across all five defense categories is 200.

Both Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) and Cramer (1988) have reviewed evidence regarding the reliability and validity of the DMI; this information will be summarized in this section. Internal consistency of the five defense scales was discussed in both reviews. Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) reported mean internal consistency coefficients (averaged over four studies). Mean correlations ranged from .61 (PRO) to .80 (TAO). Cramer (1988) cited the results of one additional study
(Vickers & Hervig, 1981) in which Cronbach's coefficient alpha ranged from .77 (PRN) to .92 (TAO). Overall, TAO appeared to be the most internally consistent scale and PRO, the least (Cramer, 1988).

Test-retest reliability has also been evaluated. Mean temporal stability coefficients, averaged over three studies, ranged from .62 (PRO) to .82 (TAO) over two-week to four-week intervals (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). Cramer (1988) cited mean test-retest correlations (computed across all five defenses) from five studies. Mean coefficients ranged from .59 (Rohsenow, Erickson, & O'Leary, 1978) to .84 (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969). Individual scale test-retest correlations listed by Cramer (1988) ranged from .48 (males' PRO scores, 17-day interval) (Weissman, Ritter, & Gordon, 1971) to .93 (males' and females' TAO scores, one-week interval) (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969). Again, TAO fared best in terms of temporal stability and PRO, the worst.

Studies of content validity (Blacha & Fancher, 1977; Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969) were discussed by Cramer (1988) and Ihilevich and Gleser (1986). In both of these studies, clinically-trained raters classified DMI response choices into categories of defense.
satisfactory correspondence was found in both studies for TAS, REV, and PRN; on average, about 70% of these DMI responses were classified into the defense category that Gleser and Ihilevich (1969) has intended. However, TAO and PRO responses were misclassified to a troublesome degree: Approximately only 40% of the responses for these two categories were correctly classified. Moreover, there was a "noticeable overlap" (Cramer, 1988, p. 145) between TAO and PRO responses. Cramer (1988) speculated that this nonindependence between the two scales could be indicative of poor content validity and supported this speculation by noting the consistent positive intercorrelations between TAO and PRO (as well as between PRN and REV) (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969; Gleser & Sacks, 1969; Gur & Gur, 1975; Woodrow, 1973). However, Cramer (1988) allowed that it was possible that the defenses may actually overlap in reality. She therefore recommended that attention be focused on whether correlated defenses relate in differing ways with various psychological variables (see construct validity section below).

Research into the DMI's concurrent validity has been hindered by the lack of similar standardized measures to utilize as criteria (Cramer, 1988).
However, Cramer (1988) reviewed seven studies that focused on relating DMI scores to other defense measures. REV was the only scale to consistently demonstrate expected relationships with criterion measures of denial (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969; Vickers & Hervig, 1981), primitive defense (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969), repression in males (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1969), avoidance (Schueler, Herron, Poland, & Schultz, 1982), and the MC SDS in females (Evans, 1979). Moderate support was indicated for the concurrent validity of the TAO, PRO, and TAS scales (Cramer, 1988). No support has been generated as yet for the concurrent validity of the PRN scale (Cramer, 1988).

Evidence relevant to the DMI's construct validity has also been reviewed by Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) and Cramer (1988). Many consistent and theoretically meaningful results have been obtained. Field dependence (FD) has been related to REV and TAS, while field independence (FI) has been associated with TAO and PRO (Bogo, Winget, & Gleser, 1970; Donovan, Hague, & O'Leary, 1975; Ihilevich & Gleser, 1971; Rohsenow et al., 1978). Various measures of field dependence-independence were employed in these studies. Bogo et al. (1970) used Oltman's (1968) portable Rod-and-Frame Test, while Ihilevich and Gleser (1971) used Jackson's...
(1956) shortened version of the Embedded Figures Test. Oltman, Raskin, and Witkin's (1971) Group Embedded Figures Test was employed in the studies of Donovan et al. (1975) and Rohsenow et al. (1978). Both Cramer (1988) and Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) indicated that PRN has not been related to either FD or FI. Evidence cited by Cramer (1988) suggested that the FD/FI-defense relationships were not gender-mediated. Thus, while males and females were equal in degree of preferred defense (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1971), there was no difference in FD/FI. Cramer further noted that males high on REV and TAS are FD, while men high on TAO and PRO are FI (Donovan et al., 1975; Rohsenow et al., 1978). Other evidence of a relationship with another cognitive variable, memory constriction, was cited by Cramer (1988): Schill and Becker (1978) found an expected relationship between REV and the unavailability of memories.

Support for the differential construct validity of correlated defenses was presented by Ihilevich and Gleser (1986). Defenses that typically are correlated have been found to relate in an independent manner to other psychological constructs. Thus, data suggest that REV and PRN relate predictably with different sorts of
psychopathology. For example, Seif and Atkins (1979) found that phobics considered to employ hysterical defenses scored significantly higher on REV, while phobics thought to use obsessive defenses were higher on PRN. Scholz (1973) found that different groupings of suicidal patients were associated with differential use of REV and PRN defenses. Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) also indicated that, as expected, PRN defenses have been associated with higher levels of functioning and adjustment than REV defenses (Minsky, 1978; Rader, Bekker, Brown, & Richart, 1978; Rohsenow et al., 1978; Yu, 1981). Evidence for differential construct validity between TAO and PRO (Schueler, 1981; Schueler et al., 1982; Kipper & Ginot, 1979) was also presented by Ihilevich and Gleser (1986). TAS was found to be "clearly differentiated from the other four defenses" (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986, p. 75).

A host of other results cited by Ihilevich and Gleser (1986) lend support to the scales' construct validity. In comparison with DMI norms, coronary patients scored higher on REV and TAS, and lower on TAO, as expected (Hoffman-Delvaux & Mertens, 1978; Peglar & Borgen, 1984). Male alcoholics have scored higher on TAS and REV (Donovan, Rohsenow, Schau, & O'Leary, 1977;
O'Leary et al., 1975; Sugerman, Sheldon, & Roth, 1975) and female alcoholics have been higher on REV (Sugerman et al., 1975) when compared to general adult DMI norms. The defense scales have related to anxiety in predicted ways. REV has related negatively to conscious anxiety (Ranseen, 1982; Ritigstein, 1974; Rohsenow et al., 1978), but positively to higher autonomic arousal (Assor, Aronoff, & Messe, 1986), various physical disorders (Minsky, 1978; Peglar & Borgen, 1984), and a mixture of other psychosomatic symptoms (Gur & Gur, 1975). PRO and TAS have been positively related as expected to anxiety measures (Ranseen, 1982; Ritigstein, 1974; Peglar & Borgen, 1984). PRN, expected to be the most effective defense in managing anxiety, has shown negative correlations with poor coping (Yu, 1981), autonomic arousal (Assor et al., 1986), and hypertension (Minsky, 1978). PRN and REV correlated positively with measures of self-esteem, TAS correlated negatively, and TAO and PRO appeared unrelated to self-esteem (Berg, 1982; Dudley, 1975; Kaley & Hovey, 1983).

Regarding the relation of the various DMI scales to demographic variables, females generally score higher on TAS and males score higher on TAO and PRO (Cramer, 1988; Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). The relation between
gender and PRN and REV remains unclear (Cramer, 1988; Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). REV has been found to correlate positively with age (.14 to .33), while TAO and PRO have correlated negatively with age (−.20 to −.39) (Cramer, 1986; Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). PRN and TAS tend to show a moderate increase with age (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). Lower socioeconomic status has been associated with REV and the less frequent use of TAO (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). Educational level appears to be the demographic variable least related to DMI defense categories (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986).

Cramer (1988) summarized conclusions regarding the DMI and its various scales. She believed that distinguishing between the five scales was justified, in spite of the correlations between PRN and REV, and TAO and PRO, since it is possible that they are correlated in the real world, perhaps along an internalizing-externalizing of negative affect dimension. In addition, evidence indicates that the correlated scales predictably relate in independent ways to differing, relevant psychological variables (Cramer, 1988). Regarding the validities of the scales, Cramer (1988) concluded that empirical support was strongest for REV and TAS. PRN and PRO were considered in need of further
clarification. TAO was believed to measure "the tendency to direct aggression outwards" (Cramer, 1988, p. 162), but its validity as a defense per se was questioned.

Four reasons governed the choice of the DMI for use in the current investigation. First, a measure of defense mechanisms was considered important because of the prominence accorded to defenses in the clinical-theoretical literature on hysterical trait clusterings. Second, a major advantage of the DMI is that it allows the researcher to assess different types of defenses all in one measure. Thus, it lends itself well to studying convergent and discriminant construct validity. Third, the DMI has satisfactory reliability and validity data, especially for the scales of central relevance here (i.e., REV and PRN). And finally, the DMI’s paper-and-pencil format fit in with the group-testing design of the current study.

The DMI’s Projection scale is not included in the analyses to follow. The DMI’s ipsative format means that scores are not linearly independent and the score on the last scale is determined by the scores on the other four scales. The test’s authors suggested dropping one scale from analyses as a way to deal with
the problem (Ihilevich & Gleser, 1986). Consequently, the Projection scale was excluded because it is of least theoretical relevance and because it is the weakest scale.

**Procedure**

As mentioned above, subjects were tested in groups in the current investigation. Initially, subjects scheduled themselves for an experiment appointment by selecting a time and date listed in a sign-up booklet in the psychology department. However, it became evident that students were slow in signing up to participate in studies. Therefore, the experimenter obtained students' phone numbers and called them in order to schedule appointments. This shift in the original procedure seemed reasonable since these were students who would eventually sign up for research participation anyway. Informal contact with other experimenters confirmed that difficulty in promptly obtaining subjects was not restricted to this study. Prior to the calls, a randomized list of the 145 total available subjects was drawn up and calls were made in a random order. Efforts were made to include subjects from across all four of the introductory psychology classes. Data was collected over the course of the semester in order to balance
potential effects of subject characteristics (e.g., compulsive characteristics in those who might participate early) and external stressful events (e.g., exams, papers).

Upon arrival, subjects were given a packet of personality measures and asked to devise a code. They were then instructed to write the code and the date on the front of the packet and, after the session began, on all the tests inside the packet.

After all subjects had arrived, the experimenter introduced himself, thanked them for their participation, and offered a brief explanation of the project. Subjects were then directed to open their packets, read the enclosed consent form (see Appendix G), ask questions, and sign the form if willing to participate. Consent forms were then collected and kept separately from the data. No one refused to participate in this phase of the study. Subjects next completed a brief demographics sheet which requested age, major, race, and year in school. This sheet was followed by the administration of the GEFT using the standard instructions detailed in the test's manual (Witkin et al., 1971).

Following the GEFT, subjects completed on their
own a randomized arrangement of the LKA, EPQ, DMI, and the MC-SF. Tests were randomized to distribute potential order effects across the sample. Subjects were asked to complete the tests in the order given. After the measures were completed, subjects turned in their packets and received a written statement (see Appendix H) more fully explaining the experiment. Course credit was then assigned for participation. A total of 97 subjects completed the packets. Data from three subjects were excluded, two because of extensive missing data and one due to apparent difficulty with language comprehension.

A random subsample of subjects received a sheet (see Appendix I) at the end of their packets, asking the student if she would be willing to schedule a time to return in one month to retake one of the questionnaires (the LKA). Participation in a second session was voluntary and for credit, and the possibility of random selection had been mentioned in the initial consent form. Thirty-seven students elected to return and were rescheduled. Of these, 32 subjects returned for the second appointment. Data for one subject were dropped due to missing values. Those who returned were given a new consent form (see Appendix J) and, again, allowed to
ask questions and, if desired, withdraw without penalty. No subjects elected to withdraw. Signed consent forms were then collected, subjects were readministered the LKA, and credit was assigned for participation. Consent forms were again kept separately from the data.
Consistency of Measurement and Factor Replicability

The first research question was focused on psychometric issues of consistency (internal and temporal) and factor replicability of the LKA when used with a normal sample.

Regarding internal consistency, it was hypothesized that adequate estimates of internal consistency would be found for the 20 LKA personality trait subscales. In order to test this, Cronbach’s alpha was computed for the college students’ LKA responses. Results are displayed in Table 3. As may be seen, four subscales have clearly acceptable levels of internal consistency: Suggestibility, Orderliness, Aggression, and Fear of Sexuality. Fifteen other subscales obtained more moderate alpha levels. Of these 15 subscales, eight obtained Cronbach’s alphas in the .60s (Exhibitionism, Emotional Constriction, Dependence, Perseverance, Oral Aggression, Sexual Provocativeness, Self Doubt, and Emotionality), four in the .50s (Rejection of Others, Pessimism, Egocentricity, and
Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha Estimates of Internal Consistency for the 20 LKA Personality Trait Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.7160</td>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>.4261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>.6743</td>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>.4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>.5429</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>.6737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>.6082</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>.5790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td>.6844</td>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>.5913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>.6901</td>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>.5422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td>.7089</td>
<td>Self Doubt</td>
<td>.6228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>.1187</td>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
<td>.6291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>.6580</td>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>.7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>.7335</td>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>.4488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 87 (seven cases deleted due to missing data).
Rigidity), and three in the .40s (Superego, Passivity, and Parsimony). One subscale, Obstinacy, was clearly poor in terms of internal consistency (alpha = .1187). Thus, this hypothesis was only partially supported, since only four of the 20 LKA personality trait subscales demonstrated adequate estimates of internal consistency. Corrected item-to-total correlations are also presented, for informational purposes, in Appendix C. These are Pearson product-moment correlations between the item’s score and the sum of the remaining items. The correction is the removal of the particular item from the rest of the scores for the subscale.

The next hypothesis concerned the replicability of the LKA’s factor structure. It was predicted that the three factors found in prior research, representing Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical trait clusterings, would be obtained with a normal sample. A principal components analysis was performed (with ones on the diagonals) on the 20 LKA personality trait subscale scores. Eigenvalues were initially plotted (see Figure 1). As can be seen, an elbow formed at the seventh factor, indicating that a six-factor solution was appropriate. Sixty-six percent of the common variance was accounted for by a six-factor solution. The first
Figure 1. Eigenvalue Plot of the Factors
factor accounted for 22.3% of the common variance, the second factor accounted for 14.2% of the common variance, the third factor, 10.7%, the fourth factor, 7.5%, the fifth factor, 6.2%, and the sixth factor, 5.2% of the common variance.

A Varimax rotation to simple structure was performed on the six-factor solution. Varimax rotation has been employed in prior factor analyses of the LKA. While more sophisticated factor models may now exist, this was believed to be an appropriate procedure because the current study is attempting to replicate earlier work. Factor loadings of the rotated factor matrix are presented in Table 4. Factor loadings of .50 and above are considered significant. As may be seen, the results are not clearly interpretable. The first factor appears to be an Oral factor. Factor 2 and 4 seem to be parts of an Obsessive factor. Factors 3 and 5 look to represent versions of a Hysterical factor. Finally, Factor 6 is primarily an Obstinacy factor.

Given the lack of clarity in the above results, the principal components analysis was repeated. The six-factor solution had been extracted and rotated because the eigenvalues plot suggested that this combination was how the LKA data were best explainable.
Table 4

Loadings of the LKA Personality Trait Subscales in a Principal Components Factor Analysis of the LKA, Rotated to Varimax Simple Structure (Six-Factor Solution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>-.08179</td>
<td>-.14294</td>
<td>.25664</td>
<td>.04741</td>
<td>.72593</td>
<td>.27438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>.51344</td>
<td>.16875</td>
<td>.17420</td>
<td>.55178</td>
<td>.23539</td>
<td>-.20905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>.24322</td>
<td>.12780</td>
<td>.38479</td>
<td>.48620</td>
<td>.33245</td>
<td>.26019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>.25365</td>
<td>.01246</td>
<td>.14412</td>
<td>-.02414</td>
<td>.82224</td>
<td>.05100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td>.02287</td>
<td>.52108</td>
<td>-.00662</td>
<td>-.24867</td>
<td>-.54825</td>
<td>.03660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>-.16207</td>
<td>.03075</td>
<td>.76090</td>
<td>.08331</td>
<td>.23376</td>
<td>.15832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td>.03027</td>
<td>.01513</td>
<td>.28664</td>
<td>.69263</td>
<td>-.08368</td>
<td>-.27184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>.07873</td>
<td>.08555</td>
<td>.08158</td>
<td>.05532</td>
<td>.24788</td>
<td>.80966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>.15851</td>
<td>-.12207</td>
<td>.54788</td>
<td>.32222</td>
<td>.38188</td>
<td>.13300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>-.34921</td>
<td>.70240</td>
<td>-.18283</td>
<td>.03713</td>
<td>.01865</td>
<td>.13349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>0.04797</td>
<td>0.66482</td>
<td>-0.10220</td>
<td>0.05801</td>
<td>-0.00103</td>
<td>-0.09757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>0.63968</td>
<td>-0.01499</td>
<td>0.11421</td>
<td>0.22905</td>
<td>0.11664</td>
<td>0.17665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>-0.80727</td>
<td>0.17607</td>
<td>-0.09886</td>
<td>0.06377</td>
<td>-0.05505</td>
<td>-0.09554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>0.31962</td>
<td>0.08671</td>
<td>-0.33257</td>
<td>0.39470</td>
<td>0.30677</td>
<td>-0.32296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>0.22007</td>
<td>-0.03392</td>
<td>0.07020</td>
<td>0.74292</td>
<td>0.04656</td>
<td>0.37375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>0.18564</td>
<td>0.72422</td>
<td>0.07415</td>
<td>0.05490</td>
<td>-0.20090</td>
<td>0.04177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Doubt</td>
<td>0.66616</td>
<td>0.27284</td>
<td>-0.18187</td>
<td>0.18358</td>
<td>-0.00954</td>
<td>-0.24198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
<td>0.19798</td>
<td>-0.23247</td>
<td>0.78081</td>
<td>0.13333</td>
<td>0.03909</td>
<td>-0.09548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>0.36152</td>
<td>0.46964</td>
<td>0.46884</td>
<td>0.02950</td>
<td>0.07925</td>
<td>-0.40646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>-0.31056</td>
<td>0.48365</td>
<td>-0.08177</td>
<td>0.50059</td>
<td>0.08976</td>
<td>0.20776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The goal was to see if the three factors of interest would replicate at that level of analysis. However, the results suggest that the six-factor solution is too narrow of a level; only portions of the factors of interest are in evidence. Therefore, it was decided to examine the LKA data at a broader level of decreasing the number of factors. Three factors were thus extracted. This number of factors was justified by the repeated findings of prior LKA factor analyses and because only three factors were of interest in the current study. The same eigenvalues displayed in Figure 1 were again plotted. The three-factor solution accounted for 47.1% of the common variance. As with the first factor analysis, the first factor accounted for 22.3% of the common variance, the second, for 14.2% of the common variance, and the third, 10.7% of the common variance.

A Varimax rotation to simple structure was again performed. Table 5 lists the factor loadings obtained. Results of this factor analysis yielded much more clearly interpretable findings. Factor 1 appears to form a Hysterical factor, Factor 2, an Oral factor, and Factor 3 seems to be an Obsessive factor. Thus, the hypothesis that the three factors obtained in previous
Table 5

Loadings of the LKA Personality Trait Subscales in a Principal Components Factor Analysis of the LKA, Rotated to Varimax Simple Structure (Three-Factor Solution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>0.72181</td>
<td>-0.11324</td>
<td>-0.16794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.29196</td>
<td>0.77821</td>
<td>0.05125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>0.67537</td>
<td>0.39631</td>
<td>0.12156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>0.54485</td>
<td>0.23154</td>
<td>-0.19005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td>-0.44780</td>
<td>0.00820</td>
<td>0.46540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>0.66211</td>
<td>-0.04848</td>
<td>0.00776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td>0.25197</td>
<td>0.42714</td>
<td>0.12118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>0.55893</td>
<td>-0.13925</td>
<td>0.15697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>0.69806</td>
<td>0.26210</td>
<td>-0.16201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>-0.03498</td>
<td>-0.16012</td>
<td>0.77717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>-.13344</td>
<td>.24433</td>
<td>.58237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>.23888</td>
<td>.56650</td>
<td>-.14931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>-.03980</td>
<td>-.56619</td>
<td>.42411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>-.02681</td>
<td>.52231</td>
<td>.02674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>.50658</td>
<td>.35926</td>
<td>.14634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>-.11169</td>
<td>.33422</td>
<td>.62056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Doubt</td>
<td>-.22467</td>
<td>.73871</td>
<td>.06571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
<td>.45162</td>
<td>.27663</td>
<td>-.34053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>.05604</td>
<td>.60628</td>
<td>.17953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>.29009</td>
<td>-.00358</td>
<td>.68653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research would be replicated was supported. Using a criterion of .50 as a minimum factor loading cut-off, Factor 1 is composed of loadings on the following seven LKA personality trait subscales: Aggression (.72181), Oral Aggression (.69806), Egocentricity (.67537), Exhibitionism (.66211), Obstinacy (.55893), Emotionality (.54485), and Rejection of Others (.50658). All of these subscales, except for Rejection of Others, have loaded on presumed Hysterical factors in past research (see Table 1).

Finally, hypotheses were made regarding the test-retest reliability of the LKA subscales and a Hysterical (here, presumably Factor 1) scale with a normal sample. It was predicted that high, positive correlations would be obtained for the LKA subscales, since they presumably tap stable traits. Coefficients of stability are presented in Table 6 for the 20 LKA subscales. All of the 20 subscales demonstrated significant positive Pearson product-moment correlations, ranging from .5464 (Obstinacy) to .9291 (Sexual Provocativeness). Seventeen of these correlations were high, while three (Obstinacy, Rigidity, and Self Doubt) were moderate. T-tests for correlated means were also performed in order to determine differences between LKA subscale means at
Table 6

Coefficients of Stability for the 20 LKA Personality Trait Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>0.7627**</td>
<td>Parsimony</td>
<td>0.8297**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.8347**</td>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>0.7815**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>0.7526**</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>0.8411**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>0.8025**</td>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>0.7162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Constriction</td>
<td>0.7654**</td>
<td>Rejection of Others</td>
<td>0.7372**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>0.8140**</td>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>0.6035**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Sexuality</td>
<td>0.7965**</td>
<td>Self Doubt</td>
<td>0.6160**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy</td>
<td>0.5464*</td>
<td>Sexual Provocativeness</td>
<td>0.9291**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Aggression</td>
<td>0.8363**</td>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>0.7831**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>0.8315**</td>
<td>Superego</td>
<td>0.7614**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 31 \)

\*\( p < .01 \)

\**\( p < .001 \)
the two points of test administration. It was predicted that there would be no significant differences. Only two subscales exhibited significant differences between means at the two times of testing. These subscales were Obstinacy ($t(30) = -2.62, p < .05$) and Rigidity ($t(30) = -3.12, p < .01$). One other subscale, Perseverance, narrowly missed significance ($t(30) = 1.99, p < .06$). Thus, the hypotheses made for the test-retest reliability of the LKA personality trait subscales were generally supported. The Obstinacy subscale presented problems in terms of temporal consistency, as it had concerning internal consistency.

It was not possible to determine the temporal stability of the LKA Factor 1. That would have required two factor analyses of the LKA, utilizing data from the same sample tested at two different points in time. However, it was possible to derive a (presumed) Hysterical scale from the test-retest sample data by counting up the endorsements on the subscales that loaded on Factor 1 (i.e., the Aggression, Oral Aggression, Egocentricity, Exhibitionism, Obstinacy, Emotionality, and Rejection of Others subscales). A high, positive correlation was hypothesized between the scores on this derived scale following a one-month
interval. Results bore this out ($r = .8428, p < .001$). It was also hypothesized that there would not be a significant difference between means at the two times of testing. Again this hypothesis was supported ($t(30) = 0.00, p = 1.00$). The mean for this scale at the time of initial testing was 25.2581 ($S = 6.889$). The scale's mean at retest one month later was again 25.2581 ($S = 7.589$). Thus, the scale seems to measure a very stable clustering of personality traits.

**Construct Validity**

The second research question addressed the issue of the construct validity of Factor 1. Factor 1's loadings are very similar to prior presumed Hysterical factors found with the LKA. However, it must be determined whether Factor 1 correlates with other variables in ways one would expect a measure of hysterical trait clusterings to correlate. Therefore, a series of Pearson product-moment correlations were computed in order to evaluate convergent and discriminant construct validity. Means and standard deviations of the total sample for the construct validity variables are listed in Table 7. Intercorrelations of the construct validity variables are presented in Table 8 for informational purposes.

Construct validity correlations are presented in
Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Total Sample for Construct Validity Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEFT</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.298</td>
<td>4.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-TAO</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39.478</td>
<td>9.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-PRN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37.556</td>
<td>6.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-TAS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.311</td>
<td>6.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-REV</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40.611</td>
<td>7.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-P</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.223</td>
<td>2.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-E</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.947</td>
<td>4.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.277</td>
<td>5.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-L</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.713</td>
<td>3.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-SF</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.319</td>
<td>2.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns vary due to missing data for DMI measures.

Not analyzed in construct validity correlations. Presented here for informational purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-TAO</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-PRN</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-TAS</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI-REV</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-P</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-E</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-N</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-L</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-SF</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001
Table 9. A moderate, negative, significant correlation between Factor 1 scores and GEFT scores, reflecting convergent construct validity, was hypothesized. As may be seen in Table 9, this hypothesis was not supported. Instead, a low, nonsignificant correlation was found. A moderate, positive, significant correlation, again demonstrating convergent construct validity, was expected between EPQ-E scores and Factor 1 scores. However, since a low, positive, significant correlation was obtained, this hypothesis was only partially supported. The hypotheses of no relation between Factor 1 scores and scores on the EPQ-P, EPQ-N, and EPQ-L scales were meant to show evidence for discriminant construct validity. However, significant correlations were found for all three of these scales. Correlations with the EPQ-P and EPQ-N scales were low and positive, while the correlation with the EPQ-L scale was low and negative (see Table 9).

To demonstrate convergent construct validity, it was hypothesized that a high, positive, significant correlation would be found between DMI-REV scores and Factor 1 scores. However, as shown in Table 9, a nonsignificant, low, negative correlation was found. Hence, this hypothesis was not supported. Again to reflect convergent construct validity, a positive,
Table 9

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between LKA Factor 1 and Construct Validity Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>GEFT</th>
<th>DMI-TAO</th>
<th>DMI-PRN</th>
<th>DMI-TAS</th>
<th>DMI-REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.0040</td>
<td>.4129***</td>
<td>-.1130</td>
<td>-.1109</td>
<td>-.1332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>EPQ-P</th>
<th>EPQ-E</th>
<th>EPQ-N</th>
<th>EPQ-L</th>
<th>MC-SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.3606***</td>
<td>.2101*</td>
<td>.2711**</td>
<td>-.3306**</td>
<td>-.4032***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 91 for DMI measures due to missing data.

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
significant correlation of lesser magnitude was expected between DMI-TAO scores and Factor 1 scores. Inspection of Table 9 shows that this hypothesis was supported. The prediction of a high, negative, significant correlation between DMI-PRN and Factor 1 scores was not supported. DMI-PRN scores did not significantly correlate, and the correlation obtained was low and negative. Thus, the relationship between DMI-PRN and Factor 1 did not suggest convergent construct validity.

The prediction of no correlation between DMI-TAS scores and Factor 1 scores was meant to reflect discriminant construct validity. This hypothesis was supported.

Finally, it was hypothesized that the MC-SF would correlate positively and significantly with Factor 1, reflecting convergent construct validity. However, this was not supported. Instead, a significant negative correlation, of moderate magnitude, was found (see Table 9).

Overall, Factor 1 did not relate to variables in ways that would have been predicted by theory and research on hysterical trait clusterings. The following significant correlations were found between Factor 1 scores and construct validity variables: DMI-TAO (.4129), EPQ-P (.3606), EPQ-N (.2711), EPQ-E (.2101),
EPQ-L (-.3306), and MC-SF (-.4032). When inspecting the construct validational data, Factor 1 seems to reflect an aggressive, impulsive, anxious group that is not concerned about socially-approved behavior.

**Two-Point Code Configurations**

Though it appears strongly questionable that Factor 1 is indeed a Hysterical factor, it was decided to nevertheless investigate the two-point code configurations, in an effort to explore the utility of the LKA in identifying subtypes of the factor.

The 31 subjects who scored in the upper one-third of the distribution of Factor 1 factor scores were determined. Their scores on each of the seven subscales that loaded on Factor 1 (i.e., Aggression, Egocentricity, Emotionality, Exhibitionism, Obstinacy, Oral Aggression, and Rejection of Others) were then examined and the two highest subscales determined. Subjects were then sorted into groupings based on which two subscales they scored the highest. If a subject's highest subscale score was on Exhibitionism and her second highest was on Obstinacy, she was sorted into an Exhibitionism-Obstinacy grouping. If another scored highest on Obstinacy and second highest on Exhibitionism, she was placed in the same grouping as
the above subject. If a subject's scores for the highest score tied for both Exhibitionism and Obstinacy, she was categorized into the above grouping. If, however, a subject had more than two subscales tied for first place, or evidenced a tie for second place, that subject was dropped. This was done in order to maintain the purity of the subtypes.

Of the 31 subjects, 15 students were dropped because of failure to meet the above criteria. Of these 15 subjects, seven had three subscales tied for first place, one had four subscales tied for first place, five had two-way ties for second place, and two subjects demonstrated three subscales tied for second place.

Sixteen subjects were thus available to be sorted into two-subscale groupings. Of these 16 students, seven of them clearly sorted into groupings (i.e., one subscale was the highest and another was the second highest, with no ties for first or second place). The remaining nine subjects evidenced two-way ties for first place. These 16 subjects were sorted into 9 groupings, listed in Table 10. As may be seen, none of the groupings contained enough subjects in order to compare them against one another and the rest of the sample. This would have been done in an attempt to better
### Table 10

**Pairings Based on Two Highest LKA Subscale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Pairings</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality-Obstinacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism-Obstinacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression-Emotionality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism-Aggression</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism-Emotionality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression-Oral Aggression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression-Rejection of Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity-Rejection of Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstinacy-Rejection of Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
delineate subtypes of the Factor 1 trait clustering.

It will be recalled, however, that two factor analyses were performed on the LKA personality trait subscales. In the first factor analysis, six factors were obtained. Two of these, Factors 3 and 5, both looked like partial versions of what previous factor analytic research had considered to be a Hysterical factor. Using a factor loading cut-off of .50 (see Table 3), Factor 3 consisted of loadings on Sexual Provocativeness (.78081), Exhibitionism (.76090), and Oral Aggression (.54788). Likewise, Factor 5 was composed of factor loadings of Emotionality (.82224), Aggression (.72593), and Emotional Constriction (-.54825). Exhibitionism (Factor 3), Oral Aggression (Factor 3), Emotionality (Factor 5), and Aggression (Factor 5) all loaded on Factor 1. Since it was not possible to obtain adequate numbers of subjects in the two-subscale groupings for Factor 1, Factors 3 and 5 were investigated as subtypes of the personality trait clustering represented by Factor 1.

In an effort to better understand and define Factors 3 and 5, the total sample's factor scores were correlated with the construct validity variables. Pearson product-moment correlations are presented in
Table 11. Factor 3 evidenced significant correlations with (in descending order of magnitude) the EPQ-L scale (-.5187), the EPQ-P scale (.3461), the MC-SF (-.3130), the DMI-TAO scale (.2537), and the DMI-REV scale (-.2388). One Factor 3 correlation, with the DMI-PRN scale, narrowly missed significance ($p = .058$). Factor 5 correlated significantly with three scales: EPQ-N (.3486), DMI-TAO (.2376), and MC-SF (-.2277).

Finally, an effort was made to better understand how people high on Factors 3 and 5 might differ from each other and from others who were low on these factors. Thus, subjects were sorted into groups based on their Factor 3 and Factor 5 scores. The first group was composed of subjects in the upper one-third of the Factor 3 distribution and in the lower two-thirds of the Factor 5 distribution. Twenty subjects were in this Factor 3 Group. The second group ($n = 20$) consisted of subjects in the lower two-thirds of the Factor 3 distribution and in the upper one-third of the Factor 5 distribution. They were designated the Factor 5 Group. The Control Group of 41 subjects was composed of subjects who were in the lower two-thirds of the distributions of both Factors 3 and 5.

These three groups were compared on the construct
Table 11
Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between LKA Factors 3 and 5 and Construct Validity Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>GEFT</th>
<th>DMI-TAO</th>
<th>DMI-PRN</th>
<th>DMI-TAS</th>
<th>DMI-REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.0829</td>
<td>.2537**</td>
<td>-.1657</td>
<td>-.0157</td>
<td>-.2388*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>-.1530</td>
<td>.2376*</td>
<td>-.0971</td>
<td>.0457</td>
<td>-.0145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>EPQ-P</th>
<th>EPQ-E</th>
<th>EPQ-N</th>
<th>EPQ-L</th>
<th>MC-SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.3461***</td>
<td>.2683**</td>
<td>.0325</td>
<td>-.5187***</td>
<td>-.3130**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>.1524</td>
<td>.0743</td>
<td>.3486***</td>
<td>-.0813</td>
<td>-.2277*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 91 for DMI measures due to missing data.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
validity variables. Only one significant result was obtained, for the EPQ-L scale. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant between groups difference, $F(2) = 6.0936$, $p < .01$, (see Table 12). A Student-Newman-Keuls a posteriori comparison revealed a significant difference between the EPQ-L means of the Factor 3 Group ($M = 5.2$, $\bar{S} = 2.6278$) and the Control Group ($M = 8.3415$, $\bar{S} = 3.3061$). The Factor 5 Group had an EPQ-L mean score of 7.0, with a standard deviation of 3.9068.

To summarize, the two-point code configurations were dropped because of an insufficient number of subjects in the available groupings. However, two subtypes of Factor 1, derived from an earlier, narrower level of factor analysis, were examined. The first of these subtypes, Factor 3, was composed of positive factor loadings on the following LKA subscales: Sexual Provocativeness, Exhibitionism, and Oral Aggression. The second subtype of Factor 1, Factor 5, was composed of positive factor loadings on the LKA subscales of Emotionality and Aggression, and a negative factor loading on Emotional Constriction. Correlations with the construct validity variables showed that Factor 3 correlated significantly and negatively with the EPQ-L
Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between Factor 3 Group, Factor 5 Group, and Control Group on EPO-L Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134.1237</td>
<td>67.0618</td>
<td>6.0936*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>858.4195</td>
<td>11.0054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>992.5432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
scale, the MC-SF, the DMI-REV scale, and significantly and positively with the EPQ-P scale and the DMI-TAO scale. Factor 5 correlated significantly and positively with the EPQ-N scale and the DMI-TAO scale, and significantly and negatively with the MC-SF. A comparison of the mean scores of a Factor 3 Group, a Factor 5 Group, and a Control Group on the construct validity variables revealed only one significant difference: The Factor 3 Group had a significantly lower mean EPQ-L scale score than the Control Group.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to examine the LKA as a measure of histrionic personality style in normal subjects. Thus, the LKA was investigated in terms of psychometric issues (consistency and factor replicability), construct validity, and practical utility in developing subtypes of histrionic personality style, all with a sample of female college students.

Consistency of Measurement and Factor Replicability

The first research question dealt with psychometric issues of consistency of measurement and factor replicability. Results concerning internal consistency of the LKA personality trait subscales were mixed. Only four of the subscales (Suggestibility, Orderliness, Aggression, and Fear of Sexuality) evidenced clearly satisfactory levels of internal consistency. Fifteen of the subscales obtained more moderate internal consistency estimates, ranging from .4261 (Parsimony) to .6901 (Exhibitionism). One
subscale, Obstinacy, clearly demonstrated poor internal consistency. Cronbach's alphas for the LKA subscales that loaded on the presumed Hysterical factor were as follows: Aggression (.7160), Oral Aggression (.6580), Egocentricity (.5429), Exhibitionism (.6901), Obstinacy (.1187), Emotionality (.6082), and Rejection of Others (.5913).

The overall mixed internal consistency results suggest that many of the subscale items may need to be reworded, have items dropped, and/or have new items written, in order to improve the internal consistency estimates. Alternately, it is possible that a sample bias could have produced these results, though this is unclear. If, however, items were to be reexamined, the corrected item-to-total correlations presented in Appendix C would be helpful. These item-to-total correlations are lower than those reported by Lazare et al. (1970). However, in Lazare et al.'s (1970) study, item-to-total correlations were not corrected for the contribution of the individual item to the total subscale score. Hence, their correlations were biased upwards.

In contrast to internal consistency, findings regarding temporal consistency over a one-month period
were quite good. Overall, the test-retest coefficients of stability supported the LKA subscales and a derived, presumed Hysterical scale as, respectively, measures of stable traits and a stable trait clustering. Seventeen subscales evidenced high positive, significant coefficients of stability, ranging from .7162 (Pessimism) to .9291 (Sexual Provocativeness). Three subscales (Obstinacy, Rigidity, and Self Doubt) exhibited moderate positive, significant test-retest correlations of .5464, .6035, and .6160, respectively. In addition, a presumed Hysterical scale, derived from factor loadings (see below), also obtained a high positive, significant test-retest correlation. Differences between means at the two LKA administrations were also examined. Two subscales (Obstinacy and Rigidity) exhibited significant differences over the one-month period. In general, the Obstinacy subscale performed the poorest in terms of consistency of measurement, both internal and temporal. Therefore, the items on this subscale in particular appear to need reexamination and reworking.

In terms of factor replicability, the LKA factor loadings strongly corresponded to the three factors found in previous research. In addition, Factor 1 was
highly similar to earlier factors labeled "Hysterical". In the current study, the Aggression, Oral Aggression, Egocentricity, Exhibitionism, Obstinacy, Emotionality, and Rejection of Others subscales loaded on Factor 1. With the exception of the Rejection of Others subscale, all of these subscales have been found in a majority of the earlier reported LKA factor analyses (see Table 1). Thus, with a "normal" college student sample, the LKA manifested a similar structure to that which emerged when psychopathological groups were sampled. Further, one of the factors that emerged, Factor 1, was very similar to previous Hysterical factors.

Two points are interesting to note. First, it will be recalled from Chapter II that some researchers (Lazare et al., 1966, 1970; van den Berg & Helstone, 1975) were struck by the loadings of the Aggression and the Oral Aggression subscales on the presumed Hysterical factor. Lazare et al. (1966, 1970) attributed this to their psychopathological sample and thought they were therefore tapping the lower-level hysterical character disorder. Van den Berg and Helstone (1975) used a mixed sample of clinical and normal subjects. They speculated that their factor reflected an aggressive reaction pattern that people with hysterical traits tended to employ. However, Lazare et al. (1966) suggested that
these loadings instead reflected an assertiveness in acting upon the world, rather than aggressiveness per se. These subscale loadings have never been fully clarified.

The second point worth noting is the loading of the Rejection of Others subscale on the factor. Such a loading for a Hysterical factor seems, on the surface, improbable. A logical inspection of the items in this subscale (see Appendix C) suggests that four items (12, 26, 86, and 113) involve a desire for social stimulation and a dislike of boredom, while the remaining three items may reflect a general aloofness and turning away from other people. Thus, four of the items appear relevant to histrionic personality style, while the other three do not. This subscale loading on the presumed Hysterical factor is also not clear.

**Construct Validity**

The second research question focused on the construct validity of Factor 1. Given Factor 1's strong resemblance to earlier Hysterical factors, it presumably is also a Hysterical factor. However, the issue here is whether or not Factor 1 relates in predictable ways to personality variables that have theoretical and/or quantitative research support as plausible components of
histrionic personality style. Thus, a series of hypotheses were made regarding the convergent and discriminant construct validity relationships between Factor 1 and these personality variables.

Overall, the construct validity findings did not support Factor 1 as a Hysterical factor measuring histrionic personality style. The predicted relationships with measures of field dependence (GEFT), repression and denial (DMI-REV), intellectualized defenses (DMI-PRN), and social desirability (MC-SF), meant to evidence convergent construct validity, were not obtained. No significant relationships were found between Factor 1 and the first three of the above variables. While the relationship with the MC-SF was significant, it was negative, opposite to the hypothesized direction. Only one convergent construct validity hypothesis was fully supported, that of a positive relationship between a measure of externalized expression of aggression (DMI-TAO) and Factor 1. One other convergent construct validity hypothesis was partially supported. A moderate, positive, significant correlation was predicted between Factor 1 and a measure of extraversion (EPQ-E). However, a low, positive, significant correlation was obtained.
Regarding discriminant construct validity, several hypotheses of no relationship between Factor 1 and presumably nonmeaningful personality variables were made. However, contrary to prediction, measures of Neuroticism (EPQ-N), Psychoticism (EPQ-P), and dissimulation/socialization (EPQ-L) all evidenced significant correlations with Factor 1. Only one discriminant construct validity correlation was supported, that of no significant relationship between Factor 1 and a measure of internalizing of negative affect (DMI-TAS). Thus, overall, of the 10 construct validity hypotheses made, only two (one convergent and one discriminant) were fully supported and one (convergent) partially supported.

These results were surprising because the obtained construct validity correlations suggested that Factor 1 was tapping an angry, neurotic, and sociopathic dimension of people who do not value culturally-approved behaviors. There are two possible explanations for this. First, the construct validity of the construct validity measures themselves could be in question. On the whole, this is not a strong possibility. However, it may have some merit with the GEFT. It was noted earlier that the GEFT, when used with females, may not
tap field dependence-independence (FDI) to a great enough extent. Thus, the lack of support for the GEFT hypothesis may be attributable to questionable GEFT validity. If the GEFT did not tap FDI to a significant degree, the predicted correlation would not be obtained.

The second, and more likely, possibility to account for the unexpected construct validity correlations is that the findings reflect an artifact of the sample. This was considered a possibility because of the unexpected correlations between Factor 1 and the EPQ-N and the EPQ-P scales. Comparisons of the total sample's means and standard deviations on the various construct validity variables with published norms for appropriate age and gender were therefore undertaken. These t-test comparisons revealed several significant differences between the current sample and the normative groups. The sample in the present study was significantly higher than the norms for the EPQ-N, the EPQ-P, the DMI-TAO, and, surprisingly, the MC-SF. The findings of significantly higher scores for this sample on the MC-SF is puzzling and difficult to reconcile with the overall pattern of significant differences. However, the MC-SF is a relatively new form of the full-scale MCSDS. It may be that the published MC-SF norms
(Zook & Sipps, 1985) reflect idiosyncrasies of the normative sample and thus, are not highly reliable. Therefore, more data must be gathered to better determine normative MC-SF means and standard deviations. Based on the above comparisons, however, the assumption of a normal sample appears challenged.

Three other pieces of information also support the notion of a sample artifact affecting the results. First, a sample artifact would explain the loading of the Rejection of Others subscale on Factor 1. Second, recall from Chapter III that it was difficult to obtain subjects who would sign up for experiments. This could suggest oppositionality. However, there is no way of knowing the extent to which this is atypical of subjects in general. Third, the obtained construct validity correlations are consistent with Standage et al.'s (1984) findings of psychiatrically-diagnosed hysterical character disorder patients scoring significantly higher than controls on the EPQ-P scale and significantly lower than controls on the EPQ-L scale. In that study, Standage et al. (1984) thought that the hysterical character disorder patients could also have been diagnosed as antisocial character disorder and that the generalizability of the results was questionable. In a
similar way here, it is very possible that the sample had similar (i.e., antisocial) characteristics which colored the results.

The question is raised whether the study sample was truly "normal." Are there any other factors which could have affected the results, given that it is commonly assumed that college student subject pools are "normal"? Four other explanations are possible. First, it could be that the construct validity tests were not appropriate to a late adolescence sample. However, all of the tests have been used with students in that age range. Second, the testing procedures could have elicited "nonnormal" test responses from the subjects. This seems unlikely, since the impact of stressful events was controlled for by conducting the study over the course of the semester. In addition, potential order effects were controlled for by administering the tests in a randomized order. Likewise, random responding on the part of the subjects would have been distributed across the tests. Third, there could have been extrinsic factors in operation of which the researcher was not aware (e.g., instructors' attitudes towards the courses they taught; a tuition increase). But while even trait measures can be affected by external events, relative to state measures they should
not have been as influenced. And fourth, perhaps the results reflect developmental issues of late adolescence. However, this does not seem plausible because of the findings of the t-test comparisons with appropriate age and gender groups, the Rejection of Others factor loading, and the consistency of the construct validity correlations with Standage et al.'s (1984) EPQ results. Thus, it seems most likely that there was something unusual about the pool of introductory psychology female students, as a group, that semester, that was picked up in the factor analysis and in the construct validity correlations.

The current study’s hypotheses were developed with a normal sample in mind. However, since the normality of the overall sample has been questioned, the hypotheses can not be considered to have been adequately tested. Therefore, it was decided to select a subsample of subjects who fit within normal ranges of the various measures and reexamine the construct validity hypotheses, to see if Factor 1 would then resemble a histrionic personality style dimension. Criteria for a normal subsample may be determined in different ways. The approach used here was to select subjects who scored within one standard deviation on certain measures, based on those measures’ norms. The measures used to select
out this group were the EPQ-N, the EPQ-P, and the EPQ-L scales. EPQ-N and EPQ-P were chosen as being the most sensitive to possible psychopathology, while the EPQ-L was used to screen for possible dissimulation.

Hence, subjects were selected out who scored within one standard deviation of the normative group’s mean (EPQ-N: $M = 12.75, S = 5.04$; EPQ-P: $M = 2.07, S = 2.03$; EPQ-L: $M = 6.97, S = 3.69$) (Eysenck, Barrett, Spielberger, Evans, & Eysenck, 1986). Thus, score ranges were set for the EPQ-N (8-18), the EPQ-P (0-4), and the EPQ-L (3-11) scales, and subjects who scored within these ranges on all three scales were chosen to form a normal subsample. Thirty-five subjects (approximately 37% of the total sample) were sorted out based on these criteria. Mean EPQ-N for this subsample was 12.97, with a standard deviation of 3.31. Mean EPQ-P was 2.11, with a standard deviation of 1.35. And mean EPQ-L was 7.06, with a standard deviation of 2.33.

With the normal subsample, three of the 10 construct validity hypotheses were supported. One of these dealt with convergent construct validity. Thus, the hypothesis of a lower magnitude, positive correlation between Factor 1 and DMI-TAO was supported ($r = .4167, p < .01$). Two hypothesized divergent construct validity correlations were also obtained: No
significant relationships were found between Factor 1 and EPQ-N, and Factor 1 and DMI-TAS (though the latter was close; $r = -0.2761, p < 0.06$). Three other significant results, not predicted, were a positive correlation between Factor 1 and EPQ-P ($r = 0.3169, p < 0.05$), a negative correlation between Factor 1 and MC-SF ($r = -0.3080, p < 0.05$), and a negative correlation between Factor 1 and EPQ-L ($r = -0.2994, p < 0.05$).

Overall, one more hypothesis is clearly supported for the normal subsample (three out of 10) than for the total sample (two out of 10). Nevertheless, the picture of the presumed Hysterical factor (i.e., Factor 1) which emerges is still not consistent with prior theory and research on hysterical trait clusterings. A comparison of the significant results from the total sample and the normal subsample is presented in Appendix K, as an aid in defining what the factors might mean in the two groups. As may be seen, with the normal subsample, DMI-TAO increases to a very small degree, EPQ-P and EPQ-L decrease to a small degree, and MC-SF shows a decrease in importance. Significant relationships with EPQ-E and EPQ-N are lost. Thus, with the "normalized" subsample, neurotic and extraverted elements disappear, but the factors otherwise appear to be very similar in both
samples. The most notable change is the decrease in MC-SF. Thus, with a normal subsample, there is an increase in the valuing of culturally-approved behaviors. Alternately, this may be seen as a decrease in the strength of what seems to be an antisocial element in Factor 1.

Factor 1, even with a more normalized subsample, did not tap a histrionic personality style dimension. With both samples, Factor 1 resembles a bipolar "Impulsive-Unsocialized-Sensation Seeking" (i.e., aggression/impulsivity-socialization) factor found by Zuckerman et al. (1988, Table 4, Factor 2, p. 102) in their factor analyses of several temperament measures with an undergraduate sample. This factor was composed of positive loadings on, for example, boredom susceptibility, EPQ-P, risk-taking, sensation seeking, aggression, and lack of inhibitory control (Zuckerman et al., 1988). Negative loadings included social desirability, EPQ-L, restraint, responsibility, and socialization (Zuckerman et al., 1988). A histrionic personality style factor would probably be more similar to Zuckerman et al.'s (1988) "Sociability" factor (Table 4, Factor 1, p. 102). This was composed of loadings on, for example, EPQ-E, sociability, affiliation, monotony
avoidance, energy level, and social desirability (Zuckerman et al., 1988). A single negative loading was found for detachment. There should be little aggressive component in a histrionic personality style factor. Thus, the findings with a normal subsample, taken in conjunction with the total sample results, suggest strongly that the LKA's Factor 1 does not measure a hysterical trait clustering, at least in the present study. The data are not strong enough to contend that Factor 1 is a valid measure of histrionic personality style with this sample. Characteristics of the sample as a whole seem to have affected the results, such that it was not possible to detect a histrionic personality style dimension.

Two-Point Code Configurations

The third research question centered on the LKA's practical utility in developing two-point code configurations as subtypes of histrionic personality style. Although Factor 1 proved to be more of a bipolar aggression/impulsivity-socialization dimension than a histrionic personality style dimension, the two-point code configurations were nevertheless investigated. This would allow for an examination of the feasibility of such codes with the LKA. However, they would not
relate to histrionic personality style, as originally intended. Unfortunately, as it turned out there were not enough subjects in any of the two-point groupings to allow for an examination of such Factor 1 subtypes. Therefore, the two-point configuration was dropped for this factor structure. However, the idea of two-point code configurations still seems to be viable for future investigations. The main problem here was a variety of configurations forming with an insufficient number of subjects in the different groupings. Therefore, efforts should be made to employ a greater number of subjects, since, by looking for "pure" subtypes and maintaining stringent inclusion criteria, large numbers of potential subjects will be lost. It should be noted, too, that the variety of configurations formed here do not relate to a hysterical trait clustering dimension. Thus, it is not known whether a truly Hysterical LKA factor would break down into many, or only a few, two-point code configurations.

However, the first factor analysis performed produced a six-factor solution, with two factors that resembled partial versions of Factor 1. Each of these (Factor 3 and Factor 5) was primarily composed of three factor loadings. For both Factor 3 and Factor 5, two of
these three primary factor loadings were also found on Factor 1, suggesting that they could be considered as subtypes of Factor 1. Factor 3’s primary loadings were on Sexual Provocativeness, Exhibitionism, and Oral Aggression. Based on these factor loadings, Factor 3 looked like a dimension of angry narcissism, involving drawing attention to oneself, likely through sexual means, and argumentativeness. Factor 5’s primary loadings were on Emotionality, Aggression, and Emotional Constriction (negative loading). These factor loadings suggested an expressive anger dimension involving poor control of emotions generally, but particularly, anger.

The construct validity variables were correlated with factor scores for Factor 3 and Factor 5 in an effort to more clearly define the meaning of the factors. Factor 3’s correlations suggest impulsivity, aggressiveness, less need to present oneself in a positive light, and less dissimulation/socialization. EPQ-L and MC-SF, while similar constructs, appear to be operating differentially here. The distinctions between them are unclear and need to be drawn more sharply. The differential correlations are interesting findings, but difficult to interpret. It is clear from their intercorrelations, however, (see Table 6) that though
they correlate to a moderate and significant degree, there is still a fair amount of variation that is not accounted for between them. Thus, they are each also tapping unique sources of variation, which seems to be reflected in the differential correlations with Factor 3. Speculatively, it may be that the common dimension between EPQ-L and MC-SF is a general devaluation of social propriety. Factor 5's relationships with the construct validity variables reflect a dimension of neuroticism (tension, worrying), external expression of anger, and, again, less of a need to present oneself in a positive light. The chief difference between Factor 3 and Factor 5, however, is the neurotic element found in Factor 5.

Only one significant difference was found between people high on Factor 3, high on Factor 5, and low on both Factor 3 and Factor 5. The high Factor 3 group had a significantly lower EPQ-L scale mean than did the low Factor 3-low Factor 5 group. This is consistent with the moderately negative correlation of Factor 3 with EPQ-L. Thus, compared to low Factor 3-low Factor 5 subjects, high Factor 3 subjects seem to evidence less valuing of socially approved behavior. Again, this may evidence a general devaluation of social propriety.
Overall Conclusions

What do the findings of the present study suggest in terms of the LKA as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings? Test-retest correlations indicate that the LKA measures stable traits. However, the construct validity correlations provide damaging evidence against considering Factor 1 for the present sample as a truly Hysterical factor. Factor 1 seems to pick up a bipolar aggression/impulsivity-socialization dimension, even with a normal subsample. If a factor analysis was redone with a clearly normal sample, however, different factor loadings might be obtained that may more accurately comprise a Hysterical factor. Although the construct validity results seem to reflect characteristics of the sample, the Aggression and Oral Aggression subscales have consistently loaded on the (presumed) Hysterical factor in all prior LKA studies. It may be, therefore, that these past studies did not obtain a Hysterical factor, but rather, an aggression/impulsivity-socialization factor, as found here. Thus, the jury is still out on the LKA as a measure of hysterical trait clusterings. The present findings could in large part be due to sample characteristics, though this would have to be
investigated further in other studies of the factor’s construct validity.

The broader issue here is what the current findings mean in terms of our knowledge about the definition and measurement of hysterical trait clusterings. Does this study help to clarify these issues, or do sample artifacts prevent this? Unfortunately, the current study’s results do not greatly clarify, though they are an initial step in that direction. The findings raise the issue of aggression and its role in hysterical trait clusterings, and suggest that more thinking needs to be done in this area. Loadings of aggression types of subscales on prior LKA factors presumed as Hysterical have generally been explained as reflecting the lower-level hysterical character disorder in the pathological subjects tested. However, it is possible that these do not reflect low-level hysterical character disorders, but rather, an altogether different type of character pathology. For example, those presumed Hysterical factors could actually have reflected, in DSM-III-R parlance, Borderline, Narcissistic, or Antisocial Personality Disorders.

Based on the present study, it could be said that
there has been no evidence generated to support a hysterical trait clustering as measured by the LKA. One could argue that since the sample as a whole is higher on measures of aggressiveness, impulsivity, and anxiety it is not reasonable to expect to obtain a hysterical trait clustering factor. However, the aggression/impulsivity-socialization factor found here may also reflect a more general, broader dimension of personality picked up by Zuckerman et al. (1988). In their study, they used a presumably normal college student sample. Yet, a similar dimension has also been found in this study with an atypical college student sample. It may be, then, that the LKA picks up this dimension, not a hysterical trait clustering dimension, as has been thought. Thus, the LKA may not offer documentation of hysterical trait clusterings as a scientific construct after all; other measures may be better suited for this. The data from the current study, however, do not offer documentation of hysterical trait clusterings.

Future Research

Future research needs to address the issues of additional factor analyses with clearly normal and larger samples and the construct validity of results
that appear to form a Hysterical factor. This could provide further documentation of hysterical trait clusterings, replication of findings, and better definition of the boundaries and characteristics of hysterical trait clusterings -- if these can be adequately documented. Internal consistency of most LKA subscales, as well as temporal stability of a few LKA subscales, should also be addressed. In order to better distinguish the merits of different hysterical trait clustering measures, it would be helpful to pit one measure against several others in predicting membership in a hysterical trait clustering criterion group.

If a satisfactory measure of hysterical trait clusterings can be found, research should also be directed towards bridging into the temperament work in current personality psychology. As discussed in Chapter II, many temperament variables seem highly relevant to the definition and explanation of hysterical trait clusterings. Temperament variables could potentially play a rich role in enhancing our understanding of hysterical trait clusterings, an understanding which could then facilitate better-informed applications in clinical, medical, academic, and vocational settings.

Finally, the use of male subjects in studying
hysterical trait clusterings is strongly needed. What personality characteristics comprise a male hysterical trait clustering? Are hysterical trait clusterings in females and antisocial trait clusterings in males "gender variants" (Widiger et al., 1988) of the same personality structures? Are male hysterical trait clusterings quantitatively identifiable? Future research should be used to inform on this unresolved clinical question, which also speaks to the issue of sex bias in personality classification.
SUMMARY

The long-standing clinically-derived construct of histrionic personality style has received little quantitative research attention. Consequently, its precise definition and measurement as a scientific construct has remained unclear. This paucity of research seems largely due to two factors, conceptual confusion in the theoretical literature and the lack of an appropriate measure. In order to facilitate research and definition, measure development is considered the most basic issue on which to focus. Of the available measures, the Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory’s (LKA) Hysterical factor (LKA-H) appeared to exhibit the most promise. Therefore, the goal of the study was to investigate the LKA-H as a measure of histrionic personality style in normal subjects.

Ninety-four female undergraduates completed the LKA and several other personality measures (Group Embedded Figures Test, Defense Mechanisms Inventory, Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, and a short-form Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale). Regarding consistency of measurement, only four of the 20 LKA
personality trait subscales evidenced adequate internal consistency. In contrast, temporal reliabilities for the 20 LKA subscales and a derived LKA Hysterical scale generally indicated stable measures. The LKA factor structure found in prior research (presumed Oral, Obsessive, and Hysterical factors) was replicated. However, convergent and discriminant construct validity correlations did not support the LKA-H as a histrionic personality style dimension. Rather, the LKA-H obtained with this sample resembled a bipolar aggression/impulsivity-socialization dimension found in recent temperament research. Although the construct validity results may reflect sample artifacts, it is possible that the findings instead reflected a bipolar general personality dimension. An insufficient number of subjects was available to investigate subtypes of the LKA-H based on relative LKA subscale elevations, as planned. However, two subtypes of the apparent aggression/impulsivity-socialization factor were examined, based on a narrower level of factor analysis. Suggestions made for future research included additional LKA factor analyses, LKA item revisions, further examination of LKA-H construct validity, and bridging the study of histrionic personality style into temperament research.
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APPENDIX A
CHARACTERISTICS OF HYSTERICAL PERSONALITY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Among 22 Authors Agreed on by</th>
<th>Among 14 Authors Agreed on by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic Behavior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Lability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentrism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seductiveness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childishness**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Alarcon (1973), Table 2.

**Was not considered as a defining characteristic in the final clinical profile.
LKA SCALES

Please read each of the following statements carefully. If you agree with the statement or if it is generally true for you, circle "T". If you do not agree with it or if it is generally not true for you, then circle "F". Please make a response for each statement.

1. I am considered aggressive by some of my acquaintances. T F
2. I am easily discouraged when things go wrong. T F
3. My feelings and emotions are easily aroused. T F
4. Sometimes when I am in a crowd, I say humorous things which I expect strangers will overhear. T F
5. I am calm and placid most of the time T F
6. When I have decided how to do a thing I dislike having others make suggestions. T F
7. I find myself frequently disagreeing with and contradicting other people. T F
8. I pride myself on my thriftiness. T F
9. Good luck is more help than hard work. T F
10. I can work at a difficult task for a long time without getting tired of it. T F
11. It is misery to be born, pain to live, and grief to die. T F
12. I get annoyed when my time is taken up by people in whom I am not interested. T F
13. When suddenly confronted by a crisis, I can become inhibited and do nothing. T F
14. I am easily swayed by others. T F
15. I am apt to express my irritation rather than hold it back.  
16. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares, or my relation to others.  
17. I give full vent to my sentiments when I am stirred.  
18. I often dramatize a story which I am telling and demonstrate exactly how everything happened.  
19. I have had a difficult sexual adjustment.  
20. I usually express myself with caution and restraint.  
21. My ways of doing things generally work out better than those of others.  
22. I must admit I enjoy swearing.  
23. I do not like to waste money.  
24. I am able to keep working, day in and day out, without getting tired or bored.  
25. Life is a heavy load along a rough and weary road.  
26. I find the company of dull people completely unbearable.  
27. I prefer to associate with my old friends, even though by doing so I miss the opportunity of meeting more interesting people.  
28. I avoid gay and irresponsible pleasure-seekers.  
29. I am slow to decide on a course of action.
30. I have enjoyed flirting. T F
31. People like me because I will usually go along with what they want. T F
32. If somebody annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him. T F
33. I think of myself sometimes as neglected and unloved. T F
34. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others. T F
35. I like to have people watch me do the things which I do well. T F
36. I have often thought that sexually, men are animals. T F
37. I have strong opinions on many subjects. T F
38. I am systematic and methodical in my daily life. T F
39. Work has no place in paradise. T F
40. I can stand very long periods of exertion. T F
41. I have frequently been told that I have a scornful manner when I argue, especially with people whose ideas I consider inferior to mine. T F
42. I am usually consistent in my behavior; I go about my work in the same way, frequent the same routes, etc. T F
43. I have been a "tease." T F
44. It is difficult for me to stick to my own opinions when someone else insists on theirs. T F
45. If I come across a domineering person, I am inclined to put him in his place. T F
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I am apt to complain about my sufferings and hardships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I talk a good deal about myself, my experiences, my feelings and my ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I find sex distasteful and frightening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I am moderate in my tastes and sentiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I do not usually back down from my opinions even when others argue with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I tend to make biting or sarcastic remarks when I criticize other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I usually get through my work efficiently without wasting time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>It is better to do nothing than make a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I like to collect things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am a horse for work. I am seldom exhausted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Hope brings only disappointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I usually keep myself somewhat aloof and hard to approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I find that many of my tastes and sentiments have remained relatively constant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I am conscientious about telling the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I enjoy being &quot;carried away&quot; by romantic movies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I am a good follower.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63. I am rather sensitive, impressionable, and easily stirred.  

64. I feel pleasantly exhilarated when all eyes are upon me.  

65. It takes a good deal to make me angry.  

66. I tend to be stubborn about things I consider important.  

67. I organize my daily activities so that there is little confusion.  

68. Comfort is necessary for a contented life.  

69. I believe in "saving for a rainy day".  

70. I can enjoy a long spell of continuous activity.  

71. I avoid closeness and familiarity with other people.  

72. I do not allow myself the enjoyment of certain unprofitable pleasures.  

73. I dislike making hurried decisions.  

74. I can often be easily convinced.  

75. I often let myself go when I am angry.  

76. I feel lost and helpless when I am left by someone I love.  

77. I have intense likes and dislikes.  

78. I enjoy holding the floor or performing before a group.  

79. In considering marriage, I do not or did not enjoy thinking about the sexual aspects.
When in a rage, I tend to physically express my feelings, like stamping my feet, grinding my teeth, pushing my fist into my mouth, biting my fingernails or handkerchief or other objects, or tearing something.

When I have to undertake something difficult, I make out a plan of procedure.

I don’t like competition; it irritates rather than stimulates.

I keep a careful record of money that I spend.

I stick at a job even though it seems I am not getting results.

Hardly anyone cares much what happens to you.

I am intolerant of people who bore me.

I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours and an established routine is most suited to my temperament.

I do most things slowly and deliberately.

I spend a great deal of time thinking about sexual matters.

I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.

I display "temper" when the occasion warrants it.

I often exaggerate my part in an event in order to make myself appear in a more interesting light.

Although my mind is often preoccupied with sexual matters, I have an intense fear of sex.
94. I do things in a leisurely sort of way without worry or irritation. T F
95. I am fond of arguing. T F
96. I like to arrange my life so that it runs smoothly and without conflict. T F
97. It is better to play it safe rather than take a chance on success and risk failure. T F
98. I cherish the possessions that I have. T F
99. I find that I enjoy work more than relaxation. T F
100. Selfishness and envy are the most powerful motives of mankind. T F
101. I often tend to express my resentment against a person by having nothing more to do with him. T F
102. I respect custom and am therefore somewhat resistant to untested changes. T F
103. I carry a strict conscience with me wherever I go. T F
104. I am poor at quick retorts and snap judgements. T F
105. I get into a fighting mood when the occasion seems to demand it. T F
106. I feel insecure when I must act on my own responsibility. T F
107. I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles. T F
108. I feel dissatisfied if I remain unnoticed. T F
109. Others have felt that I have been afraid of sex. T F
110. My emotional life is marked by moderation and balance. T  F
111. I would love a life of ease and luxury. T  F
112. There is sure to be a snag somewhere. T  F
113. I have always preferred the company of older, talented, or generally superior people. T  F
114. I am a creature of habit. I can even endure monotony without fretting. T  F
115. I have a strong sense of responsibility about my duties. T  F
116. I think much and speak little. T  F
117. I have difficulty controlling my sexual impulses. T  F
118. I am usually willing to go along with the opinions of experts. T  F
119. I get angry and show it when I am treated with disrespect. T  F
120. I think that most people are rather self-centered and heartless. T  F
121. I find it difficult to control my emotions. T  F
122. I have enjoyed leading men on and then running the other way. T  F
123. I become angry when someone insists on doing something with which I do not agree. T  F
124. I sometimes enjoy going through and looking at my possessions. T  F
125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted. T  F
126. I think that I have a more rigorous standard of right and wrong than most people.  
127. I have enjoyed playing the female-male cat and mouse game.  
128. I try to get my own way regardless of opposition.  
129. I want sympathy, affection, and understanding more than anything else.  
130. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or by the slighting remarks of others and I sometimes interpret others' remarks in a personal way.  
131. At times, I have thought I was sexually frigid.  
132. I take pride in my ability to control my emotions.  
133. I usually stand up for my rights.  
134. I find that sarcasm can be a good weapon to defend my point of view.  
135. Everything I do must be precise and accurate.  
136. I have a tendency to put things off until the last minute.  
137. I feel that people who say that every cloud has a silver lining just aren't being realistic.  
138. I find it difficult to make decisions.  
139. Sometimes I feel I have no mind of my own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. I get angry and show it when I am treated with disrespect.</td>
<td>.5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am apt to express my irritation rather than hold it back.</td>
<td>.4954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. I often let myself go when I am angry.</td>
<td>.4572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If I come across a domineering person, I am inclined to put him in his place.</td>
<td>.4293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. I get into a fighting mood when the occasion seems to demand it.</td>
<td>.4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. If somebody annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.</td>
<td>.3458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am considered aggressive by some of my acquaintances.</td>
<td>.3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am easily discouraged when things go wrong.</td>
<td>.4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. I think that most people are rather self-centered and heartless.</td>
<td>.4208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. I feel insecure when I must act on my own responsibility.</td>
<td>.4202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. I want sympathy, affection, and understanding more than anything else.</td>
<td>.4160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependence (continued)

76. I feel lost and helpless when I am left by someone I love. .3878
33. I think of myself sometimes as neglected and unloved. .2930
46. I am apt to complain about my sufferings and hardships. .2930

Egocentricity

90. I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others. .4335
128. I try to get my own way regardless of opposition. .3499
130. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or by the slighting remarks of others and I sometimes interpret others' remarks in a personal way. .3324
107. I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other peoples' troubles. .2947
34. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others. .2911
16. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares, or my relation to others. .2734
47. I talk a good deal about myself, my experiences, my feelings and my ideas. -.0106

Emotionality

3. My feelings and emotions are easily aroused. .4632
77. I have intense likes and dislikes. .4060
Emotionality (continued)

17. I give full vent to my sentiments when I am stirred.  .3769

91. I display 'temper' when the occasion warrants it.  .3306

121. I find it difficult to control my emotions.  .3051

48. I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.  .2417

63. I am rather sensitive, impressionable, and easily stirred.  .1758

Emotional Constriction

50. I am moderate in my tastes and sentiments.  .5252

132. I take pride in my ability to control my emotions.  .5061

110. My emotional life is marked by moderation and balance.  .4712

65. It takes a good deal to make me angry.  .4363

5. I am calm and placid most of the time.  .4184

20. I usually express myself with caution and restraint.  .2894

94. I do things in a leisurely sort of way without worry or irritation.  .1313

Exhibitionism

64. I feel pleasantly exhilarated when all eyes are upon me.  .5777

78. I enjoy holding the floor or performing before a group.  .4277

108. I feel dissatisfied if I remain unnoticed.  .3913
Exhibitionism (continued)

18. I often dramatize a story which I am telling and demonstrate exactly how everything happened. .3896

92. I often exaggerate my part in an event in order to make myself appear in a more interesting light. .3678

35. I like to have people watch me do the things which I do well. .3565

4. Sometimes when I am in a crowd, I say humorous things which I expect strangers will overhear. .2899

Fear of Sexuality

131. At times, I have thought I was sexually frigid. .5547

93. Although my mind is often preoccupied with sexual matters, I have an intense fear of sex. .5392

19. I have had a difficult sexual adjustment. .5377

109. Others have felt that I have been afraid of sex. .5347

49. I find sex distasteful and frightening. .4528

36. I have often though that sexually, men are animals. .3257

79. In considering marriage, I do not or did not enjoy thinking about the sexual aspects. .0728

Obstinacy

37. I have strong opinions on many subjects. .1792

133. I usually stand up for my rights. .0786
Obstinacy (continued)

6. When I have decided how to do a thing I dislike having others make suggestions. .0582

123. I become angry when someone insists on doing something with which I do not agree. .0342

51. I do not usually back down from my opinions even when others argue with me. -.0232

66. I tend to be stubborn about things I consider important. .0102

21. My ways of doing things generally work out better than those of others. -.0054

Oral Aggression

52. I tend to make biting or sarcastic remarks when I criticize other people. .4215

95. I am fond of arguing. .4043

7. I find myself frequently disagreeing with and contradicting other people. .3984

80. When in a range, I tend to physically express my feelings, like stamping my feet, grinding my teeth, pushing my fist into my mouth, biting my fingernails or handkerchief or other objects, or tearing something. .3734

41. I have frequently been told that I have a scornful manner when I argue, especially with people whose ideas I consider inferior to mine. .3690

134. I find that sarcasm can be a good weapon to defend my point of view. .3267

22. I must admit I enjoy swearing. .2830
Orderliness

67. I organize my daily activities so that there is little confusion. .6423
38. I am systematic and methodical in my daily life. .6239
53. I usually get through my work efficiently without wasting time. .4411
96. I like to arrange my life so that it runs smoothly and without conflict. .4216
81. When I have to undertake something difficult, I make out a plan of procedure. .3593
135. Everything I do must be precise and accurate. .3397
136. I have a tendency to put things off until the last minute. .2923

Parsimony

83. I keep a careful record of money that I spend. .3536
69. I believe in "saving for a rainy day". .3180
98. I cherish the possessions that I have. .2306
23. I do not like to waste money. .1811
124. I sometimes enjoy going through and looking at my possessions. .1558
55. I like to collect things. .0808
8. I pride myself on my thriftiness. .0720

Passivity

39. Work has no place in paradise. .3030
Passivity (continued)

97. It is better to play it safe rather than take a chance on success and risk failure .2852
82. I don’t like competition; it irritates rather than stimulates me. .2600
54. It is better to do nothing than make a mistake. .1856
111. I would love a life of ease and luxury. .1585
68. Comfort is necessary for a contented life. .1411
9. Good luck is more help than hard work. .1346.

Perseverance

56. I am a horse for work. I am seldom exhausted. .4922
10. I can work at a difficult task for a long time without getting tired of it. .4321
40. I can stand very long periods of exertion. .4069
70. I can enjoy a long spell of continuous activity. .4012
24. I am able to keep working, day in and day out, without getting bored or tired. .3868
99. I find that I enjoy work more than relaxation. .3320
84. I stick at a job even though it seems I am not getting results. .2715

Pessimism

25. Life is a heavy load along a rough and weary road. .4909
Pessimism (continued)

11. It is misery to be born, pain to live, and grief to die.  .4105

57. Hope only brings disappointment.  .3864

137. I feel that people who say that every cloud has a silver lining just aren’t being realistic.  .2483

85. Hardly anyone cares much what happens to you.  .2212

112. There is sure to be a snag somewhere.  .2123

100. Selfishness and envy are the most powerful motives of mankind.  .2020

Rejection of Others

12. I get annoyed when my time is taken up by people in whom I am not interested.  .4167

86. I am intolerant of people who bore me.  .3973

58. I usually keep myself somewhat aloof and hard to approach.  .3658

71. I avoid closeness and familiarity with other people.  .2811

26. I find the company of dull people completely unbearable.  .2495

101. I often tend to express my resentment against a person by having nothing more to do with him.  .2445

113. I have always preferred the company of older, talented, or generally superior people.  .2171
Rigidity

114. I am a creature of habit. I can even endure monotony without fretting. .4152

87. I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours and an established routine is most suited to my temperament. .3754

42. I am usually consistent in my behavior; go about my work in the same way, frequent the same routes, etc. .3651

59. I find that many of my tastes and sentiments have remained relatively constant. .2832

102. I respect custom and am therefore somewhat resistant to untested changes. .1960

27. I prefer to associate with my old friends, even though by doing so I miss the opportunity of meeting more interesting people. .1688

125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted. .0912

Self Doubt

29. I am slow to decide on a course of action. .4668

73. I dislike making hurried decisions. .4066

104. I am poor at quick retorts and snap judgments. .3639

138. I find it difficult to make decisions. .3636

116. I think much and speak little. .3623
Self Doubt (continued)

13. When suddenly confronted by a crisis, I can become inhibited and do nothing. .2273
88. I do most things slowly and deliberately. .1552

Sexual Provocativeness

127. I have enjoyed playing the female-male cat and mouse game. .5986
43. I have been a "tease." .5842
89. I spend a great deal of time thinking about sexual matters. .3908
122. I have enjoyed leading men on and then running the other way. .3202
30. I have enjoyed flirting. .3121
117. I have difficulty controlling my sexual impulses. .2750
61. I enjoy being "carried away" by romantic movies. -.1828

Suggestibility

14. I am easily swayed by others. .6044
74. I can often be easily convinced. .6024
31. People like me because I will usually go along with what they want. .4730
44. It is difficult for me to stick to my own opinions when someone else insists on theirs. .4571
118. I am usually willing to go along with the opinions of experts. .4073
62. I am a good follower. .4000
Suggestibility (continued)

139. Sometimes I feel I have no mind of my own. .2532

Superego

103. I carry a strict conscience with me wherever I go. .3492

125. I am guided in my conduct by certain principles which I have accepted. .3312

126. I think that I have a more rigorous standard of right and wrong than most people. .3288

72. I do not allow myself the enjoyment of certain unprofitable pleasures. .2611

28. I avoid gay and irresponsible pleasure-seekers. .1630

115. I have a strong sense of responsibility about my duties. .1070

60. I am conscientious about telling the truth. -.0066

Note. Item no. 125 is scored for both the Rigidity and the Superego subscales.
APPENDIX D
EPQ ITEMS GROUPED BY SCALE AND SCORING DIRECTION

EPQ-Psychoticism

2. Do you stop to think things over before doing anything? (No)

6. Would being in debt worry you? (No)

9. Do you lock up your house carefully at night? (No)

11. Would it upset you a lot to see a child or an animal suffer? (No)

18. Do you believe insurance plans are a good idea? (No)

22. Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects? (Yes)

26. Do you enjoy hurting people you love? (Yes)

30. Do you have enemies who want to harm you? (Yes)

33. Do you enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people? (Yes)

37. Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you? (No)

43. Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with? (Yes)

46. Do people who drive carefully annoy you? (Yes)

50. Do most things taste the same to you? (Yes)

53. Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work? (No)

57. Do you like to arrive at appointments in plenty of time? (No)

61. Is (or was) your mother a good woman? (No)

65. Are there several people who keep trying to avoid you? (Yes)
67. Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurances? (Yes)

71. Do you try not to be rude to people? (No)

74. When you catch a train do you often arrive at the last minute? (Yes)

76. Do your friendships break up easily without it being your fault? (Yes)

79. Do you sometimes like teasing animals? (Yes)

83. Would you like other people to be afraid of you? (Yes)

87. Do people tell you a lot of lies? (Yes)

90. Would you feel very sorry for an animal caught in a trap? (No)

EPO-Extraversion

1. Do you have many different hobbies? (Yes)

5. Are you a talkative person? (Yes)

10. Are you rather lively? (Yes)

14. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party? (Yes)

17. Do you enjoy meeting new people? (Yes)

21. Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions? (No)

25. Do you like going out a lot? (Yes)

29. Do you prefer reading to meeting people? (No)

32. Do you have many friends? (Yes)

36. Would you call yourself happy-go-lucky? (Yes)

40. Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends? (Yes)
42. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people? (No)

45. Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party? (Yes)

49. Do you like telling jokes and funny stories to your friends? (Yes)

52. Do you like mixing with people? (Yes)

56. Do you nearly always have a "ready answer" when people talk to you? (Yes)

60. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly? (Yes)

64. Do you often take on more activities than you have time for? (Yes)

70. Can you get a party going? (Yes)

82. Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you? (Yes)

86. Do other people think of you as being very lively? (Yes)

EPO-Neuroticism

3. Does your mood often go up and down? (Yes)

7. Do you ever feel "just miserable" for no reason? (Yes)

12. Do you often worry about things you should not have done or said? (Yes)

15. Are you an irritable person? (Yes)

19. Are your feelings easily hurt? (Yes)

23. Do you often feel "fed-up"? (Yes)

27. Are you often troubled by feelings of guilt? (Yes)

31. Would you call yourself a nervous person? (Yes)
34. Are you a worrier? (Yes)

38. Do you worry about awful things that might happen? (Yes)

41. Would you call yourself tense or "highly-strung?" (Yes)

47. Do you worry about your health? (Yes)

54. Do you suffer from sleeplessness? (Yes)

58. Have you often felt listless and tired for no reason? (Yes)

62. Do you often feel life is very dull? (Yes)

66. Do you worry a lot about your looks? (Yes)

68. Have you ever wished that you were dead? (Yes)

72. Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience? (Yes)

75. Do you suffer from "nerves"? (Yes)

77. Do you often feel lonely? (Yes)

80. Are you easily hurt when people find fault with you or the work you do? (Yes)

84. Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish? (Yes)

88. Are you touchy about some things? (Yes)

EPO-Lie

4. Have you ever taken the praise for something you know someone else had really done? (No)

8. Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything? (No)

13. If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be? (Yes)
16. Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault? (No)

20. Are all your habits good and desirable ones? (Yes)

24. Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else? (No)

28. Do you sometimes talk about things you know nothing about? (No)

35. As a child did you do as you were told immediately and without grumbling? (Yes)

39. Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else? (No)

44. Do you sometimes boast a little? (No)

48. Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone? (No)

51. As a child did you ever talk back to your parents? (No)

55. Do you always wash before a meal? (Yes)

59. Have you ever cheated at a game? (No)

63. Have you ever taken advantage of someone? (No)

69. Would you dodge paying taxes if you were sure you could never be found out? (No)

73. Have you ever insisted on having your own way? (No)

78. Do you always practice what you preach? (Yes)

81. Have you ever been late for an appointment or work? (No)

85. Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today? (No)

89. Are you always willing to admit it when you have made a mistake? (Yes)
MC-SF ITEMS AND SCORE DIRECTION

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. (False)

2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way. (False)

3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. (False)

4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. (False)

5. No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener. (True)

6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (False)

7. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (True)

8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. (False)

9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (True)

10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (True)

11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. (False)

12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. (False)

13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings. (True)
You are waiting for the bus at the end of the road. The streets are wet and muddy after the previous night's rain. A car sweeps through a puddle in front of you, splashing your clothing with mud.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

1. I would note the car's license number so that I could track down that careless driver.
2. I'd wipe myself off with a smile.
3. I'd yell curses after the driver!
4. I would scold myself for not having at least worn a raincoat.
5. I'd shrug it off; after all things like that are unavoidable.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

6. Wipe that driver's face in the mud.
7. Report that incompetent driver to the police.
8. Kick myself for standing too close to the edge of the road.
9. Let the driver know that I don't really mind.
10. Inform that driver that bystanders also have rights.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

11. Why do I always get myself into things like this?
12. To hell with that driver!
13. I'm sure that basically that driver is a nice fellow.
14. One can expect something like this to happen on wet days.
15. I wonder if that driver splashed me on purpose.

How would you FEEL and why?

16. Satisfied; after all it could have been worse.
17. Depressed, because of my bad luck.
18. Resigned, for you've got to take things as they come.
19. Resentment, because the driver was so thoughtless and inconsiderate.
20. Furious, that that driver got me dirty.

In the army you hold a post of responsibility for the smooth operation of an important department which is constantly under great pressure to meet deadlines. Because things haven't been running as smoothly as they should lately, despite your initiative and resourcefulness, you have planned some changes in personnel for the near future.

Before you do so, however, your superior officer arrives unexpectedly, asks some brusque questions about the work of the department and then tells you that you are relieved of your post and your assistant is assigned to take your place.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

21. I'd accept my dismissal gracefully, since my superior is only doing his job.
22. I'd blame my superior for having made up his mind against me even before the visit.
23. I'd be thankful for having been relieved of such a tough job.
24. I'd look for an opportunity to undercut my assistant.
25. I'd blame myself for not being competent enough.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

26. Congratulate my assistant on the promotion.
27. Expose the probable plot between my superior and my assistant to get rid of me.
28. Tell my superior to go to hell.
29. I'd like to kill myself for not having made the necessary changes sooner.
30. I'd like to quit, but one can't do that in the army.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

31. I wish I could come face to face with my superior in a dark alley.
32. In the army it is essential to have the right person in the right job.
33. There is no doubt that this was just an excuse to get rid of me.
34. I'm really lucky that I only lost my job and not my rank as well.
35. How could I be so dumb as to let things slide?

How would you FEEL and why?

36. Resentful, because he had it in for me.
37. Angry, at my assistant for getting my job.
38. Pleased that nothing worse had happened.
39. Upset that I am a failure.
40. Resigned; after all one must be satisfied with having done the best one can.

You are living with your aunt and uncle, who are helping to put you through college. They have been taking care of you since your parents were killed in an automobile accident when you were in your early teens. On a night that you have a late date with your "steady," there is a heavy storm outside. Your aunt and uncle insist that you call and cancel your date because of the weather and the late hour. You are about to disregard their wishes and go out the door when your uncle says in a commanding tone of voice, "Your aunt and I have said that you can't go, and that is that."

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

41. I would do as my uncle said because he has always wanted what was best for me.
42. I'd tell them, "I always knew you didn't want me to grow up."
43. I would cancel my date, since on must keep peace in the family.
44. I'd tell them it was none of their business and go out anyway.
45. I'd agree to remain at home and apologize for having upset them.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

46. Knock my head against the wall.
47. Tell them to stop ruining my life.
48. Thank them for being so concerned with my welfare.
49. Leave, slamming the door in their faces.
50. Keep my engagement, rain or shine.
What THOUGHT might occur to you?

51. Why don’t they shut up and let me alone?
52. They never have really cared about me.
53. They are so good to me, I should follow their advice without question.
54. You can’t take without giving something in return.
55. It’s all my own fault for planning such a late date.

How would you FEEL and why?

56. Annoyed, that they think I am a baby.
57. Miserable, because there is nothing much I can do.
58. Grateful for their concern.
59. Resigned; after all, you can’t get your own way every time.
60. Furious, because they interfere with my private affairs.

You are spending your vacation visiting an old friend who has found an exciting new job in another town and has gone to live there. She invites you to go with her to a dance given that weekend at the community clubhouse.

Shortly after you arrive, she accepts an invitation to dance, leaving you with a group of strangers to whom you have barely been introduced. They talk with you, but for some reason no one asks you to dance. Your friend, on the other hand, seems to be very popular that evening; she looks as if she is having a wonderful time. As she dances past, she calls out to you, "Why aren’t you dancing?"

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

61. I’d say sarcastically, "I’m not dancing because I’d rather watch you."
62. I’d tell her that I really didn’t feel like dancing.
63. I’d go to the powder room to see what’s wrong with me.
64. I’d tell her that it’s easier to become acquainted through conversation than it is by dancing.
65. I’d get up and leave because she apparently wants to embarrass me.
What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

66. Assure her that I am perfectly content and happy so she won’t worry.
67. I’d like to slap her face.
68. Point out that one cannot expect to be the belle of the ball one’s first evening in a strange place.
69. Tell her that I know now what sort of a "friend" she really is.
70. I’d like to sink into the floor and disappear.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

71. She has it in for me.
72. I should never have come here in the first place.
73. I’m glad my friend is enjoying herself.
74. Experiences like this one can’t be avoided at a party where you don’t know the crowd.
75. I’ll make her regret her behavior.

How would you FEEL and why?

76. Upset, because I was so unsuccessful.
77. Furious at her for embarrassing me.
78. Resigned, because this is a situation every newcomer must endure.
79. Angry at being entrapped by her like that.
80. Grateful, for having had such a pleasant evening.

At your job you want to impress upon your foreman the fact that you are more skilled than your fellow workers. You are eagerly awaiting an opportunity to prove yourself.

One day a new machine is brought into the factory. The foreman calls all the workers together and asks whether anyone knows how to operate it. You sense the chance you have been waiting for, so you tell the foreman that you have worked with a similar machine and would like a chance to try your hand at this one. He refuses, saying, "Sorry, we can’t take a chance," and calls a veteran worker to come over and try to get the machine started.

No sooner has the veteran worker pulled the starter, than sparks begin to fly and the machine grinds to a halt. At this point the foreman calls and asks you if you still want a chance to try and start the machine.
What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

81. I’d say that I doubt if I could do it either.
82. I’d tell my fellow workers that the foreman wants to hold me responsible for the machine’s crack-up.
83. I’d tell the foreman that I appreciated being given the chance.
84. I’d decline, cursing the foreman under my breath.
85. I’d tell the foreman that I would try because one must never back down from a challenge.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

86. Tell that foreman that he’ll not make me the scapegoat for a broken machine.
87. Thank the foreman for not letting me try it first.
88. Tell the foreman that he should try to start the broken machine himself.
89. Point out to the foreman that experience doesn’t guarantee success.
90. Kick myself for talking myself into an unbearable situation.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

91. That foreman is really a pretty decent guy.
92. Damn him and his blasted machine.
93. This foreman is out to get me.
94. Machines are not always reliable.
95. How could I be so stupid as to even think of operating that machine.

How would you FEEL and why?

96. Indifferent, because when one’s abilities are not appreciated one’s enthusiasm is lost.
97. Angry that I was asked to do an impossible job.
98. Glad that I didn’t wreck the machine.
99. Annoyed that I was purposely put on the spot.
100. Disgusted with myself because I risked making a fool out of myself.

On your way to catch a train, you are hurrying through a narrow street lined with tall buildings. Suddenly a piece of masonry comes crashing down from a roof where repairmen are working. A piece of brick bounces off the sidewalk, bruising your leg.
What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

101. I'd tell them I ought to sue them.
102. I'd curse myself for having such bad luck.
103. I'd hurry on, for one should not permit oneself to be diverted from one's plans.
104. I'd continue on my way, grateful that nothing worse had happened.
105. I'd try to discover who those irresponsible people are.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

106. Remind the repairmen of their obligation to public safety.
107. Assure those men that nothing serious had happened.
108. Give them a piece of my mind.
109. Kick myself for not having watched where I was going.
110. See to it that those careless workers pay for their negligence.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

111. Those repairmen don't know how to do their job right.
112. I'm lucky that I wasn't seriously hurt.
113. Damn those men!
114. Why do these things always happen to me?
115. One can't be too careful these days.

How would you FEEL and why?

116. Angry, because I was hurt.
117. Furious, because I was almost killed by their negligence.
118. Calm, for one must practice self-control.
119. Upset by my bad luck.
120. Thankful that I'd gotten away with no more than a scratch.

Driving through town in the late afternoon, you arrive at one of the busiest intersections. Although the light has changed in your favor, you see that pedestrians are not obeying the "wait" sign and are blocking your path. You attempt to complete your turn with due caution before the light turns against you, as
the law requires. As you complete the turn, a traffic
policeman orders you over to the side and charges you
with violating the pedestrians' right-of-way. You
explain that you had taken the only possible course of
action, but the policeman proceeds to give you a ticket
nevertheless.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

121. I'd blame myself for having been careless.
122. I'd go to court and bring counter charges against
the policeman.
123. I'd ask the policeman why he has such a grudge
against drivers.
124. I'd try to cooperate with the policeman, who, after
all, is a good guy.
125. I'd take the ticket without question, since the
policeman was just doing his duty.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

126. Tell the policeman he can't use his position to
push me around.
127. Kick myself for not having waited for the next
green light.
128. Thank the policeman for saving me from a possible
accident.
129. Stand up for my rights as a matter of principle.
130. Slam the door in his face and drive off.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

131. He's doing the right thing, actually. I ought to
thank him for teaching me an important lesson.
132. Each man must carry out his job as he sees fit.
133. This guy ought to go back to pounding a beat.
134. How could I be so stupid!
135. I bet he gets a kick out of giving tickets to
people.

How would you FEEL and why?

136. Boiling anger, because he's making trouble for me.
137. Resentment, because he's picking on me.
138. Ashamed, because I was negligent.
139. Indifferent, after all, this sort of thing happens
all the time.
140. Relieved, because I'd been prevented from getting
into worse trouble.
You return home after spending two years in the army. At the time you joined, you had had a choice between enlistment and a position in your father's business. You preferred the army despite parental advice. Now that you are home again, you find that your range of opportunity hasn't widened appreciably. You can either join your father's business or get a job as an untrained worker. You would like to open a coffee shop, but you lack the capital necessary to carry out such an enterprise. After a great deal of hesitation, you decide to ask your father to put up the money. After listening to your proposal, he reminds you that he had wanted you to take a job with his firm instead of joining the army. Then he tells you, "I'm not prepared to throw away my hard-earned money on your crazy schemes. It's time you started helping me in my business."

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

141. I'd accept his offer since everyone depends on everyone else in this world.  
142. I would admit to him that I guess I am a bad risk.  
143. I'd tell him off in no uncertain terms.  
144. I'd tell him that I'd always suspected that he had a grudge against me.  
145. I'd thank him for holding a job open for me all these years.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

146. Go to work for him and make him happy.  
147. Give up trying and end it all.  
148. Take my father's offer since offers like that don't grow on trees.  
149. Let him know what a miser everyone thinks he is.  
150. Tell him that I wouldn't work for him if he were the last man on earth.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

151. He'll get what's coming to him one day.  
152. Family considerations can't enter the business decisions.  
153. Why was I so stupid as to bring the subject up.  
154. I must admit that my father is acting for my own good.  
155. This proves what I've suspected all along, that my father has never believed in me.
How would you FEEL and why?

156. Angry, because he doesn't want me to succeed on my own.
157. Grateful for his offer of a job with a future.
158. Resentful that he is sabotaging my future.
159. Resigned, since you can't have everything your own way all the time.
160. Hopeless, because I couldn't get my father's approval.

One afternoon while you and your best friend are cramming for exams, your boyfriend drops in unexpectedly. Although you and he have been going steady for over a year, you have not been able to see much of each other lately; therefore you are very happy he has come. You invite him in for a cup of coffee and introduce him to your girl friend. When you ring up to invite him to your house for dinner to celebrate the end of exam week, he tells you that he has come down with a bad cold and thinks that it is best for him not to leave the house. After dinner you feel sort of let down but you decide to join your parents who are going to the movies. Coming out of the movie theater with your parents, you come upon your boyfriend arm-in-arm with your best friend.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

161. I'd ignore them since I'm sure they'd try to pretend that they didn't seem me.
162. I'd greet them politely as a civilized person should.
163. I'd curse them under my breath.
164. I'd tell them that I am delighted that they have become friends.
165. I'd go home and have a good cry.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

166. Hide somewhere in order to avoid facing them.
167. To slap his face.
168. Show them that I am perfectly happy that they are together.
169. Ask her if stealing is the only way she knows of getting a man.
170. Indicate that I know that all's fair in love and war.
What THOUGHT might occur to you?

171. Naturally he likes her; she’s so much prettier than I am.
172. Self-interest can cause the best of friends to be disloyal.
173. They certainly are a pair of double-crossers.
174. I hope they get what they deserve.
175. They really do make a handsome couple.

How would you FEEL and why?

176. Pleased that they get along so well.
177. Upset, because I shouldn’t have been so trusting.
178. Resigned, because you’ve got to take life as it comes.
179. Enraged, because of their dishonesty.
180. Furious at them because of what happened.

You and an old school friend are competing for a newly vacated executive position in the firm where you work. Although both your chances seem about equal, your friend has had more opportunity to show resourcefulness in critical situations. Recently, however, you have successfully pushed through some excellent deals. In spite of this, the board of directors decides to promote your friend rather than you.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

181. I’d try to find out which director "blackballed" me.
182. I’d continue to do my duty as a responsible person must.
183. I’d accept the outcome as proof that I’m not executive material.
184. I’d protest the decision of the board most vehemently.
185. I’d congratulate my friend on the promotion.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

186. Ask the board to reconsider, since a mistake would be detrimental to the company.
187. Kick myself for having aspired to a job for which I wasn’t qualified.
188. Show the board how biased they've been in their unjust treatment of me.
189. Help my friend make a success at the new job.
190. Break the neck of each and every member of the board of directors.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

191. I guess I just don't have what it takes.
192. I probably wouldn't enjoy an executive position as much as the one I have now.
193. There certainly is something fishy about the board's decision.
194. One must take a blow such as this in one's stride.
195. Damn that board of directors.

How would you FEEL and why?

196. Happy that I still have the job I am used to.
197. Upset because my inadequacy was made public.
198. Furious at the directors because of their treatment of me.
199. Resigned, for that's the way it goes in the business world.
200. Angry, because I have been the victim of an unjust decision.
APPENDIX G
Dear Research Participant:

Thank you very much for volunteering to be involved in today's research project. Your assistance in this endeavor is greatly appreciated.

The current study is an examination of the properties of a particular questionnaire, as well as its relationship to a number of different measures. Consequently, what you will be asked to do today is to complete a number of different questionnaires. You will be given research credit for this. In addition, some of today's participants will find a sheet at the end of their packet, asking them if they would be willing to return in one month to re-take one of the questionnaires in order to examine the measure's accuracy over time. These participants have been selected at random and are free to refuse to return. There will be no penalty for any refusals. Research credit will again be given to those who do choose to return. If the student decides to schedule a second appointment, this will be done after they have completed today's session.

Please know that all the information that is collected today is confidential. This means that it will only be seen by myself and other qualified researchers and will be used for research purposes only. In addition, the information is anonymous. Your name will not appear on any of the data. Instead, information is identified by code, not name. Finally, should you decide at any point to discontinue your participation in this project, for whatever reason, please feel free to do so. Though this is very unlikely to occur, it is important for you to know that you are free to leave the study at any point without receiving any kind of penalty.

Please feel free to ask any questions. Once again, thank you for your participation today.

Sincerely,

Mark Groberski, M.A.
Graduate Student in Clinical Psychology
I have read the above and understand it.

____________________________  ________________
Student’s Signature            Date
APPENDIX H
EXPLANATION OF EXPERIMENT

The study in which you participated today is focused on further developing a measure for a particular personality style called the "hysterical personality style". People who have such a personality style are often characterized as outgoing; extroverted; sociable; dramatic; expressive of their feelings; and not overly interested in details, preferring instead to focus on the overall "big picture". In general, some people have more elements of this style than others do, and the measure being examined is designed to pick up the range of hysterical personality style scores, from low to high. Therefore, your participation is still useful and important even if you feel you do not match with the above description. Please remember that people who were asked back were chosen randomly, without attention to their own particular personality style. Like any personality style, hysterical personality can range from "normal" to "abnormal". Since I am interested in examining the "normal" range, college students were used as research subjects. Also, in order to simplify the study, it was decided to investigate the hysterical personality style in females only. Thus, only women were asked to participate in the study.

While a good deal has been written about this style in the theoretical and clinical literature, very little empirical research has been attempted, in large part because of confusion regarding exactly what hysterical personality style is or might be. One of the problems that has developed, then, is a lack of adequate measures for this personality style. Therefore, in this study I have asked you to complete one of the more promising measures, the Lazare-Klerman-Armor Personality Inventory (LKA), so that I can evaluate how well this measure works with college females. In addition, if the questionnaire is "working" the way it should, it ought to correlate in certain ways with other questionnaires. Thus, you were asked to complete a number of other measures, so that I can look at these correlations. Finally, I will be examining different ways to interpret the LKA scale’s scores for hysterical personality style.
If you are interested in reading further on this topic and other empirical issues in studying hysterical personality style, the following overview would be informative: Pollak, J.M. (1981). Hysterical personality: An appraisal in light of empirical research. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 104*, 71-105.

Once again, thank you very much for your participation in today's research. Your cooperation has been much appreciated.

Mark Groberski, M.A.
Graduate Student in Clinical Psychology
APPENDIX I
You have been selected at random to return in one month to re-complete one of the questionnaires you filled out today. This is being done in order to assess the measure's accuracy over time. This is completely voluntary on your part and you may refuse to return, with no penalty to you whatsoever. If you decide to return, you will be given research credit for the second session.

If you have further questions, please feel free to ask them. If you are willing to come in for one more session, please inform me of that when you turn in your packet, and I will schedule you for the additional appointment.

Thank you very much.

Mark Groberski, M.A.
Graduate Student in Clinical Psychology
SECOND CONSENT FORM

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you very much for agreeing to return again for this research project. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Today you will be asked to complete one of the questionnaires you had completed at an earlier date. You will receive research credit for this. Please know that all the information that is collected today is confidential. This means that it will only be seen by myself and other qualified researchers and will be used for research purposes only. In addition, the information is anonymous. Your name will not appear on any of the data. Instead, information is identified by code, not name. Finally, should you decide at any point to discontinue your participation in this project, for whatever reason, please feel free to do so. Though this is very unlikely to occur, it is important for you to know that you are free to leave the study at any point without receiving any kind of penalty.

Please feel free to ask any questions. Once again, thank you for your participation today.

Sincerely,

Mark Groberski, M.A.
Graduate Student in Clinical Psychology

I have read the above and understand it.

______________________________  ________________________
Student’s Signature            Date
APPENDIX K
SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTOR 1 AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND A NORMAL SUBSAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 94)</th>
<th>Normal Subsample (n = 35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMI-TAO</td>
<td>.4129</td>
<td>DMI-TAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-P</td>
<td>.3606</td>
<td>EPQ-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-N</td>
<td>.2711</td>
<td>EPQ-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-E</td>
<td>.2101</td>
<td>MC-SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPQ-L</td>
<td>-.3306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-SF</td>
<td>-.4032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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