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A general criticism leveled against American psychology in the last few decades is that its overconcern with operationalization, experimental rigor, and detail has led to a dead end. Specifically, American psychology's tough-minded emphasis has resulted in a bevy of molecular theories, each adequate in explaining its circumscribed realm of focus but of unclear relationship to other theories. We have arbitrarily broken the real phenomenon of study, the person, into a number of pieces; lacking an adequate concern with broad, abstract theory, we are currently unable to reassemble these now better-grasped pieces into a meaningful whole. In other words, we lack the superordinate theoretical frame needed to organize component molecular theories into a coherent picture. Noting this problem, Rychlak (1981) has called for a move toward abstract, general theorizing, theorizing which could direct more circumscribed assays of personality and provide an organizing frame for the results of such assays.
The present paper follows Rychlak's call for more abstract, general theorizing in its focus on the constructs, agency and communion (Bakan, 1966). Agency and communion address the human condition at a most fundamental level. Bakan writes:

For Bakan, the most basic, foundational distinction in human psychology is that between "I" and "not-I," or other. Agency and communion most basically represent the I's orientation toward this not-I. Agency is an orientation toward separation of I from not-I, and toward controlling the not-I from this vantage of separateness. Through such control, a sense of mastery is maintained. Communion, on the other hand, represents an orientation toward a removal of separations between I and not-I, toward a union of the two and concomittant surrender of I-ness.

A few additional points regarding the nature and breadth of agency and communion warrant mention. First, these constructs reflect orientations toward both outer
and inner worlds: the not-I to which one orients can be either other people/social context or unintegrated aspects of psyche. Regarding this less-obvious inner aspect of agency and communion, Bakan (1966) notes:

> Conceptually, the ego-id distinction, the I-it distinction; combined with the full appreciation that what is "it" to the ego is still part of the psyche nonetheless, expresses exactly what I have referred to as the combination of self-and other-reference. (p. 11)

In addition to encompassing outer and inner referents, agency and communion, as orientations, also subsume notions of trait and notions of motive, or need. For example, then, agency represents both a stable trait of "self assertion and self-expansion" and a motive reflected in an "urge to master" (Bakan, 1966, p.15). Finally, agency and communion are independent dimensions: individuals can be agentic, communal, both, or neither.

The first aim of the present paper is to examine the construct validity of agency and communion. Of prime importance in this examination will be issues of construct breadth and construct independence. First, if agency and communion are broad, superordinate constructs, then they should subsume a number of conceptually distinct supraordinate constructs which
reflect different facets of agency or communion. In like fashion, if agency and communion transcend notions of trait and motive, then trait constructs reflecting agency (or communion) should relate to motive constructs reflecting agency (or communion). Such relations would stand in opposition to the pervasive finding that trait and motive constructs do not interrelate (McClelland, 1980). Finally, agency and communion’s hypothesized independence will be investigated: supraordinate constructs tapping agency (or communion) should be largely unrelated to those reflecting communion (or agency). The culmination of this examination of agency and communion will be a multifaceted measure of the constructs.

The second aim of this paper will be to relate agency and communion to constructs of similar focus and breadth, constructs which, like agency and communion, address the individual’s orientation to internal and external worlds in a comprehensive fashion. Specifically, we will examine Millon’s (1983) eight basic personality styles and Costa and McCrae’s (1985) openness to experience. Millon, following in the tradition of Freud and many of Freud’s successors, has attempted to understand personality through its
abnormalities, working from a clinical/abnormal psychological perspective. From this vantage point, Millon (1967, 1974, 1981) has developed a system of personality classification comprised of eight basic personality styles: schizoid, avoidant, dependent's histrionic's narcissistic, aggressive, compulsive, and passive-aggressive. These styles account for the functioning of both normal and abnormal populations. Like agency and communion for Bakan, personality styles for Millon (1967) are distinctive orientations of ego, or "I," to inner and outer worlds. Personality style matches agency and communion in breadth as well as focus, explaining/organizing experience, thought, feeling, perception, and behavior. Personality style encompasses trait and need/motive constructs.

The construct of openness to experience is framed at a level of abstraction similar to that of Millon's eight styles and similarly deals with the individual's orientation to inner and outer worlds, however, Openness is grounded in a quite different theoretical tradition: openness to experience derives from the empirical, factor-analytic study of normal individuals rather than from the clinical study of abnormal people. As such, openness provides an important, alternate perspective on
inner-outer orientation, one defined in terms of normality rather than pathology.

Along with extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, openness represents one of the "Big Five" in personality research. These five dimensions have repeatedly surfaced in factor analytic assays of personality (Goldberg, 1983; McCrae & Costa, 1985; McCrae, Costa, & Busch, 1986), serving as a comprehensive framework within which to organize personality data. Openness is the only dimension of this framework that we will consider, as it is the only Big Five construct that reflects a general orientation to inner and outer worlds. Openness is defined as a receptivity toward both inner, and outer worlds (Costa & McCrae, 1985). It is reflected, then, in both an openness to stimuli originating from within, such as feelings, impulses, and fantasies, and in a receptivity toward external stimulations received via the five senses. Like agency and communion, and Millon's eight personality styles, openness is a comprehensive construct, encompassing distinct elements of personality such as need, affect, attitude, and behavior (Costa & McCrae, 1988).

In its relating of agency and communion to
personality style and openness, the present paper will attempt to circumvent problems evident in current theory and research on agency/communion-like constructs. One such problem is that most theorists have ignored the mitigating influences that agency and communion can have on one another. As already noted, this oversight will be avoided by measuring agency and communion as independent variables and examining relations between personality style/openness and combinations of agency and communion. A second flaw in current theory and research is that it has largely ignored the intrapsychic aspects of agency and communion: available measures tapping the constructs largely assess agency and communion only as orientations to the external, interpersonal world. Through relating agency and communion, assessed in only their interpersonal senses, to constructs that subsume inner AND outer orientation, agency and communion's explanatory breadth will be addressed. Of particular interest will be agency/communion's relation to facets of openness, for example openness to feelings, concerned exclusively with inner orientation.
CHAPTER II
AGENCY AND COMMUNION

In this chapter a more detailed account of agency and communion will be advanced. Critical issues covered in the first section will be construct content, the ramifications of construct independence, and the nature of the term, orientation. Following sections will review the actual facet measures of agency and communion employed and related issues.

Theoretical Background

Construct Content. In this chapter a more detailed account of agency and communion will be advanced. David Bakan (1966) has identified agency and communion as two fundamental modalities of living forms. He writes:

Agency manifests itself in the formation of separations, isolation, alienation, aloneness, the urge to master, and the repression of thought, feeling, and impulse; communion is manifested in a sense of being at one with other organisms, a lack of separations, the lack and removal of repression, contact, openness, and union, and noncontractual cooperation. (Bakan, 1966, p. 15)

Hence, these two modes oppose and complement each other: agency underlies the individual's separation of self
from external and internal contexts (individuation),
while communion characterizes the individual's merger
with the context (attachment).

Both agency and communion are captured by a few
central, defining facets. Bakan explicitly reduces
agency to three such facets or themes: separation,
mastery, and denial. Separation is reflected in the
individual's dissociation of ego or "I" from social and
intrapsychic contexts, contexts which for others would
comprise a rich life field. Separation from the social
context is exhibited in autonomy and in the person's
relative independence from the opinions and values of
other individuals or of society at large. Agentic
separation is similarly expressed in a foregoing of
strong interpersonal attachments or investments.
Intrapsychically, the separation facet of agency
manifests itself in a distancing from raw, spontaneous
experience, from feelings and impulses. In other words,
the agentic individual takes feelings and impulses as
objects (i.e., casts them out), experiencing them from
an experience-distant vantage of detachment/
extraspection.

While the separation facet of agency results in a
distancing from inner and outer worlds, the mastery
facet of agency results in a striving for domination of these disowned worlds. In the intrapsychic field, mastery is embodied by the ego, which separates itself from the chaos of id and establishes a reality-based dominion over it. Such ego-attributes as ego strength, competence's and coping also connote the ego's agentic nature (McAdams, 1984). In short, agentic mastery results in the ego or "I" becoming a controller of the intrapsychic world rather than a victim of it. In the social field, agency's mastery component is reflected in a dominating, controlling orientation toward others. Hence, mastery is reflected in drives toward competition, argument, one-upmanship, persuasion, assertion, and leadership. Bakan in particular stresses agentic mastery's association with McClelland's achievement motive, which is "a drive for attaining success or getting ahead within a competitive context with reference to a standard of excellence" (McAdams, 1984, p. 313).

While separation and mastery facets of agency reflect stances toward inner AND outer worlds, the third facet of agency, denial, is concerned exclusively with intrapsychic matters. The denial facet represents a drive to deny or repress those elements of psyche
(impulses, feelings, wishes, thoughts, etc.) that have been disavowed as "not-I." Denial is reflected in the ego's attempts to wipe the disowned psyche out of existence. Along these lines, Bakan (1966) notes, "Mastery is the function of the ego. In order to master, it rules things out of existence" (p. 89). One important consequence of agentic denial is that, paradoxically, behavior becomes out of control. Bakan (1966) writes, "it is often what is ruled out that rises and asserts itself, so there is not mastery precisely where mastery ought to be" (p. 89). Hence it is often the individual protesting righteousness, innocence, or immunity who is prone to the most diabolical and volatile eruptions of impulse and affect. Bakan additionally links agentic denial/repression to projection. Specifically, the agentic ego, in attempting to maintain its regime of sameness, attributes identity-inconsistent stimuli arising from within (i.e. impulses, affects, etc.) as belonging to someone "out there." Bakan cites the image of Satan as a prime carrier of such projections: this archetypal image has become a symbolic container for those human qualities which we collectively deny. Finally, Bakan links denial with the repetition compulsion. In an
attempt to bolster its sense of mastery over feared, repressed material, the ego closes itself off to spontaneous reactions, opting instead for rigid, tightly-controlled patterns of behavior.

Like agency, communion is reflected in three central facets: social embeddedness, intimacy, and inner receptivity. The first of these facets is manifest in the "the participation of the individual in some larger organism of which the individual is a part" (Bakan, 1966, p. 15). Social embeddedness is an orientation toward contact with, and reliance upon, one's social group, reflecting an ethic of connection rather than independence. Socially embedded people tend toward sociability, cooperativeness, and gregariousness, as benevolent relations with the social group as a whole (rather than just select individuals) are generally sought; the socially-embedded person invests wholeheartedly in social relationships, rather than ego, for the provision of direction, identity, and self-esteem. As well as immersion in the group, social embeddedness also reflects immersion in, or unquestioning adoption of, group beliefs, values, conventions, and concerns. In a sense, social embeddedness represents a relinquishing of
individuality: self-other distinctions become blurred as "I-ness" is subsumed by "We-ness."

Communion's second facet, intimacy, also concerns the interpersonal world, representing a drive toward sharing oneself and experiencing someone else in the deepest possible sense. Deriving from the Latin term for "inner" or "inmost" (Perlman & Fehr, 1987), intimacy most centrally reflects a sharing with another of that which is inmost (McAdams, 1988a). McAdams (1988a) writes:

In communion, the vulnerable self risks even greater vulnerability by surrendering control in interpersonal relations and offering the self up as a kind of gift, awaiting the reciprocal gift-giving of the other. Bakan's communion mandates intimate self-disclosure in the presence of a listener who receives the disclosure as a gift, cherishing it as a token of an ever-developing closeness. (p. 20)

Intimacy hence represents an attraction to a special type of dyadic interpersonal relationship characterized by openness, receptivity, union, and reciprocity—by a non-contractual giving of oneself and receiving of other. Also encompassed by the intimacy facet are 1) a real concern for the other's well-being and 2) a surrender of any form of control over the parameters of the relationship (McAdams, 1988b). In summary, intimacy is epitomized by "being in an encounter which is
perceived as an end in itself rather than (by) doing or striving to attain either a relationship or some extrinsic reward" (McAdams, 1988b, p. 76). On a final note, the distinction between intimacy and social embeddedness facets is worth making explicit: while social embeddedness represents more an orientation toward groups, group interaction, and group custom, intimacy represents an orientation toward dyadic interactions.

Like social embeddedness and intimacy's communion's third and final facet, inner receptivity, also connotes of the individual's participation in a larger organism. In this case, the organism is psyche. Inner receptivity is reflected in an orientation toward the spontaneous, direct experiencing of feeling, fantasy, intuition, and impulse. Rather than a controlling or restricting stance toward surgent emanations from within, this facet of communion embodies an immersion and investment in such emanations. Inner receptivity connotes intrapsychic commerce. Furthermore, it represents a drive toward psychological unity and removal of intrapsychic boundaries/separations.

Construct Independence: Agency/Communion Configurations. It should be clear at this point that
agency and communion oppose one another. In addition to standing toward one another in opposition, the two orientations are also independent of each other. Consequently, the salience of one construct cannot be considered without concurrent consideration of the opposing construct's mitigating potential. The present paper takes these points into account by classifying individuals into four general categories: low agency/low communion (LL), low agency/high communion (LH), high agency/low communion (HL), and high agency/high communion (HH). In each of these categories, the first term (H or L) denotes agency, and the second term (H or L) denotes communion.

Bakan does not address the first two categories, LL and LH, in any great detail. For our purposes, the LL configuration will be defined in the negative, as an absence or lack of the two modes just-discussed. In other words, the LL person is an individual who is not particularly invested in independence or merger.

The LH configuration is marked by an attraction toward merger unmitigated by a complementary attraction toward maintaining a sense of separateness, or "I-ness," in relation to inner and outer contexts. On the inner front, this pattern is reflected in the individual's
failure to mediate, "own," or make use of feelings and impulses: emanations from within fail to be fleshed-out with personal associations and given weight or depth. Instead, such emanations attain immediate, short-lived, shallow expression, flowing through ego like water through a sieve--unaffected. An additional consequence of this pattern is that LH individuals are relatively unable to agentically marshall feelings, impulses, and intuitions in the service of self-direction, or of ego. In summary, the combination of inner receptivity and an absense of mastery and separation results in a whispy, capricious, and unowned emotional life.

The LH pattern also has implications for the individual's orientation to external world. Kegan (1982), a Bakan-influenced theorist, captures the external aspect of the LH pattern in his account of ego stage three. In this stage, the self is completely immersed in a communal interpersonal context; there is no self independent of the shared reality of the individual's relationships with others. More accurately, LH individuals lack the ability to agentically step-back from their relationships and take them as object. Instead, LH individuals are their
relationships. This state of affairs leads to dependence rather than interdependence. In the absence of sufficient separateness and mastery, there is less of a self to give to others: leanings toward social embeddedness and intimacy become more one-sided leanings upon others, where external supports are relied upon as sole sources of direction, self-definition, and self-esteem.

While the LH configuration reflects an abandonment of agency, the HL configuration represents a one-sided investment in it. Here the maintenance of separations and the mastery/denial of that-separated-from becomes an end in itself. As an illustration of unmitigated agency, McAdams (1984) discusses the life of Japanese novelist, Yukio Mishima, who at an early age "rejects all roles and role models," and "isolates himself from the language of his body" (p. 312). As well as in marked separation, the HL configuration is also reflected in an exaggerated tendency to dominate others and control relationships in a self-serving manner (i.e., for the purposes of "I" rather than "we"). On the internal front, the HL ego's unchecked orientation toward mastery and denial leads to ego overcontrol, as reflected in 1) a squelching of spontaneity and 2) a repression/
suppression of aspects of psyche at odds with ego/I. Bakan (1966) finally links the HL configuration with anal, or obsessive-compulsive, characteristics such as orderliness, obstinancy, and meticulousness.

The HH configuration is marked by an interaction of agentic and communal forces, whereby the pure goals of agency or communion are mitigated or transposed. In the intrapsychic realm, the HH pattern is reflected in notions such as regression in the service of the ego or controlled descent. Bakan's term for this is "beholding that which has been denied." This process represents an amalgam of agentic and communal features. Agency is implied in that "that which has been denied" is being taken as object: ego has separated from psyche and can now reflect upon it from a position of control and mastery. Communion is evident in the act of beholding itself. Rather than turning away from psyche as an end in itself (i.e. unmitigated agency), the ego turns back on what it has separated from and communes with it. The not-I is addressed from the vantage of a secure base (ego) in an open, receptive manner. Actual beholding amounts to a surrender—to a "suspension of belief" that "entails suspension of mastery" (Bakan, 1966, p. 94); when we suspend belief, we become truly receptive to
experience and can commune with the formerly repressed. The HH orientation is symbolically expressed in the mythic image of the hero. Here a person of strength and/or cleverness (i.e., a strong, agenctic ego) makes a willful descent into the underworld (i.e. surrenders the ego's dominion to the not-I, the repressed) to re-emerge bearing the torch of knowledge (i.e. rebirth, integration). Similarly, Christ willfully sacrifices himself to death, a literalization of the agenctic ego's experience of inner communion, under faith that he will not die (the ego will survive inner communion).

The HH pattern similarly connotes a mixture of separation/strength and intentional surrender in its expression in the external world. Specifically, the HH individual is one who has earned a sense of individuality and "I-ness" apart from the social context. However, rather than maintaining this separation as an end in itself, the HH individual communes with others as a distinct participant. In other words, the HH person now has an individuality that he/she invests in the group or in other individuals. Just as the HH ego does not die in inner communion, the HH individuality is not lost in outer communion: rather than full-fledged immersion in and dependence upon the
interpersonal context, we see a measured participation and interdependence.

**Conceptual Clarification of Agency and Communion: Traits, Motives, and Orientations.** At this point, the content domains of agency and communion constructs have been clarified and the constructs' hypothesized independence has been underscored. One final theoretical clarification remains--that involving agency and communion's relation to notions of "trait" and "motive," or "need." The present paper addresses traits and needs/motives from the vantage of Aristotelian notions of cause. Causes in general are grand meta-constructs, or predicate assumptions, that we bring to bear in explaining or making sense of various phenomena (Rychlak, 1981). Two particular causes that Aristotle, and more recently Rychlak (1981), distinguish between are the formal cause and the final cause. The former is "any concept used to account for the nature of things (including human behavior) based on their patterned organization, shape, design, or order; the latter is "any concept used to account for the nature of things (including behavior) based on the assumption that there is a reason, end, or goal 'for the sake of which' things exist or events are carried out" (Rychlak, 1981, p. 500). Formal and final causes, then, are two different
meta-constructs or perspectives that we employ in grasping or making sense of phenomena under study. In this light, formal and final cause constructs are not mutually exclusive. Instead, they are complementary. Each accounts for things in a valuable and unique way; truly complete accounts of phenomena depend on an invocation of multiple cause constructs (Rychlak, 1981).

Trait and need/motive constructs are distinguished by the types of superordinate cause constructs that they invoke. Trait descriptions rely on formal cause constructs, explaining personality in terms of patterns of, or dispositions toward, various thoughts, emotional experiences, and/or behaviors. Motive descriptions, on the other hand, rely on final cause constructs. Here people are described or understood in terms of their goals, wishes, and/or intentions. Rather than representing different phenomena in the person "out there," trait and motive descriptions represent different and complementary framings of the same phenomenon. The same general topic, say interpersonal domination, can be explained as either a pattern of behaviors, attitudes, and emotions, or as a need to master other people without implying that the phenomena under study has changed along with its framing. Rather
than relying exclusively on traits/formal causes or on motives/final causes, theorists seeking a complete account of personality should strive for accounts that incorporate both formal and final cause framings (Rychlak, 1981).

Keeping this position in mind, we can now review the two general approaches to the trait-need (or trait-motive) distinction that prevail in the personality literature. The first of these approaches draws a sharp demarcation between trait and motive. Motive theorists in the tradition of McClelland (1951, 1984), for example, frame motives and traits as qualitatively distinct and independent constructs. Motives are "affectively-toned cognitive clusters centered around general preferences" (McAdams, 1988b, p. 71) which drive, direct, and select behavior/experience associated with these preferences/goal states. Traits, on the other hand, are stylistic variables that reflect general patterns of interpersonal functioning. Maddi (1980) also draws an explicit distinction between needs and traits: needs are "goal directed tendencies that require thought and planning," while traits are "routine habits or styles that function more or less automatically" (Costa & McCrae, 1988, p. 259). A second
approach to the trait-motive issue is adopted by
trait-oriented theorists. Here, the definition of trait
is expanded to subsume motives as part of a larger
formal cause structure. Costa and McCrae (1988), for
example, assert that the structure of motives "can be
seen as part of a broader structure of traits that also
includes characteristic affects, attitudes, and
behaviors" (p. 264).

The present paper incorporates aspects of both of
the approaches just-outlined in its conceptualization of
agency and communion as orientations. Like Costa and
McCrae's definition of "trait," "orientation" as used in
this paper embraces both formal and final cause, or
trait and need/motive, meanings. For example, communion
is viewed as both a tendency toward warm, open exchange
(trait) and as a need for contact with others
(motive/need). Unlike Costa and McCrae's formulation,
however, the term, orientation, affords primacy to
neither trait nor motive: motives are not subsumed by a
higher order formal cause network. Instead, as in the
formulations of motive theorists, the integrity and
independence of trait and motive explanations is
maintained. In summary, agency and communion are
conceived as exceedingly broad and multidimensional
tendencies in human living that ... encompass ... dimensions of interpersonal style, personal values and beliefs, and personal needs and motives" (McAdams, 1988a, p. 12). The proposed composite measures of agency and communion to be discussed next will reflect this breadth by including both trait-based and motive-based facet scales.

Summary. Agency and communion represent opposing orientations toward inner and outer worlds. While agency is a striving or tendency toward separation from context, or individuation, communion is a striving or tendency toward immersion in context, or attachment. Agency's three defining facets are separation, mastery and denial. Separation and mastery respectively represent the ego/I's dissociation from internal and external contexts and its orientation toward controlling these contexts. Agency's third facet, denial, reflects the ego's attempts to wipe the disowned psyche out of existence. Communion also has three defining facets: social embeddedness, intimacy, and inner receptivity. The first of these expresses the individual's attachment to the social group for self-direction and self-definition; the second is an urge or tendency toward open, reciprocal, and unifying dyadic relationships.
Communion's third facet, inner receptivity, reflects an immersion in the inner world of affect, impulse, fantasy, and intuition.

Agency and communion are conceived as independent orientations. As orientations, agency and communion encompass both trait and motive meanings while affording primacy to neither; as independent orientations, agency and communion interact, mitigating one another's pure effects. Consequent to this, agency and communion are broken into four configurations: LL, LH, HL, and HH. The LL configuration is simply defined by an absence of agentic and communal leanings. The LH configuration is characterized on the interpersonal front by a dependent stance toward others; rather than bringing or devoting an identity to others, the LH individual depends on others for an identity. Intrapsychically, the LH person is immersed in feelings, fantasy, and impulse and is unable to "hold" these inner emanations or employ them in the service of self-direction. The HL individual, by contrast, is oriented toward separation from and dominion over inner and outer contexts. Interpersonally, we see a domineering, autonomous, self-serving stance, while intrapsychically we see ego over-control. Finally, the HH configuration represents a blending of agentic
and communal themes, where a distinct individuality is willfully sacrificed to outer and inner contexts in a controlled manner. Through this, "I" merges with "not-I" without losing its differentiation/distinctness.

In the next two sections of this chapter, the actual measures of agency and communion used will be examined. Of particular importance here will be the classification of measures in terms of the specific agency or communion facets they reflect. Following this examination will be a consideration of McClelland's (1980) distinction between operant and respondent measures and its relevance to the measures employed. Finally, the present chapter will culminate in a classification of measures in terms of 1) facets of agency and communion tapped and 2) location on the operant-respondent dimension.

Measures of Agency

**TAT Power Motivation.** Winter (1973) has developed a Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) measure of the power motive, which is a "recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of having impact and feeling strong ... vis-a-vis the environment" (McAdams, 1988b, p. 84). As a facet measure of agency, power motivation captures the mastery facet of agency; "the essence of power is the
ability to make the material world and the social world conform to one's own image or plan for it" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 400). Indeed, mastery is reflected in each of the power motive's four defining themes: conquest, organization, prestige, and exploitative relationships. Conquest represents the urge to master in its most primitive, unveneered form—in the urge to dominate through patently aggressive acts. Power-motivated males participate in directly competitive sports significantly more often than others and also carry-out more aggressive acts, such as insulting store clerks and yelling in traffic (Boyatzis, 1973; Winter, 1973). Similarly, power motivation is positively correlated with frequency of reported arguments in working-class males (McClelland, 1975).

The power motive's second defining theme, organization, represents a more sublimated expression of agentic mastery. Here mastery over others is sought through the occupation of socially-sanctioned power positions. For example, power motivation correlates positively with occupation of leadership positions in university student organizations (Winter, 1973) and with office-holding in organizations by working-class adults (McClelland, Wanner, & Vanneman, 1972). Power
motivation has also been linked to a preference for careers in which the individual may direct the behavior of others with the use of positive and negative sanctions (Winter & Stewart, 1978). Finally, Fodor and Smith (1982) established a link between power motivation and occupational behavior, finding high-power individuals to foster an authoritarian, discussion-inhibiting atmosphere when appointed leader of a problem-solving group.

Power motivations's third defining theme, that of prestige, reflects Hobbes' (1651) observation that "Reputation of power is power...what quality soever maketh a man beloved, or feared of many; or the reputation of such a quality, is Power" (p. 70). In seeking prestige, the individual attempts to attain agentic mastery (or feelings of agentic mastery) over others through association with socially agreed-upon signs of power. Along these lines, power motivation is related to number of credit cards regularly carried by working class and executive males (Boyatzis, 1973; Winter, 1973). For college students, power motivation correlates positively with having prestige possessions, such as televisions, framed posters, or tape players, in dorm rooms.
Power motivation's final, defining theme of exploitative relationships amounts to a mastery-based orientation toward love and friendship. This theme is embodied by the literary character, Don Juan, who "sought power by seducing an endless series of women, deceiving and killing, where necessary, to reach this goal" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 410). Researchers have reported relationships between power motivation and males' sexual habits consistent with this picture: power motivation correlates positively with number of sexual partners (Winter, 1973) and with disclosure of details of sex life (McClelland, 1975). More generally, high-power men have an eat-them-up-and-spit-them-out orientation toward love relationships, evidenced in a tendency to move from one serious relationship to another in rapid succession. High-power males are also likely to marry women who choose not to pursue professional careers, women who presumably allow them to feel strong and in-control (i.e. to feel mastery). In the realm of friendship, agentic males and females tend to adopt an active, assertive, controlling role, and prefer large groups to more intimate dyads (McAdams, Healy, & Krause, 1986).

In summary, the envelope of themes and related
correlates surrounding TAT-assessed power motivation supports its construct validity as a measure of the mastery facet of agency. To date, however, theory and research have only addressed power motivation as an orientation toward mastering the external, social world.

**PRF Autonomy.** Although originally based in Murray's (1938) taxonomy of needs, the Personality Research Form (PRF) Autonomy scale, and the other PRF scales to be cited shortly, purport to measure "personality traits broadly relevant to the functioning of individuals in a wide variety of situations" (Jackson, 1984, p. 4). While power motivation captures agency's mastery facet, PRF autonomy captures the separation facet. Specifically, PRF autonomy reflects an orientation toward other people characterized by independence, self-reliance, self-determination, non-conformity, and rebelliousness. The autonomous individual is one who "tries to break away from restraints, confinement, or restrictions of any kind; enjoys being unattached, free, not tied to people, places, or obligations (Jackson, 1984, p. 6). Virtually all of the PRF Autonomy scale's 16 items are explicitly concerned with with agentic separation. Ten of the items address the individual's separation from
the social context, from reliance on others and social rules/conventions (Sample items: "I am quite independent of the opinion of others"/true; "I like to do whatever is proper"/false); the remaining six assess urges toward separation (sample item: "My greatest desire is to be independent and free"/true) and positive affective experience concomittant to experiences of separation (sample item: "I delight in feeling unattached"/true).

Validity data for this scale, and for the other PRF scales to-be-discussed, comes from three general sources: peer ratings, vocational interest research, and correlations with other psychological inventories. In the realm of peer ratings, Paunonen (1979) found a substantial correlation between self and roommate ratings on PRF autonomy items. Self-reported PRF autonomy also correlates in the expected directions with hetero-method peer behavior ratings. Specifically, autonomy correlates negatively with behavioral ratings associated with commitment to social convention, such as clothes-consciousness, law abidance, and religious commitment (Jackson, 1984). In the realm of vocation, autonomy correlates with separation-oriented job interests, interests emphasizing isolation, individuality, and/or self-expression. For example,
autonomy correlates positively with interests in the creative arts and in vocations of author (females only) and naturalist-agriculturist (females only) (Jackson, 1984). Similarly, autonomy correlates negatively with interest in vocations that stress interdependence or interaction, such as office work or teaching (males only) (Jackson, 1984).

Attempts to establish the PRF Autonomy scale's convergent and discriminant validity also suggest its correspondence to agency's separation facet. Autonomy correlates in the predicted direction with the Interpersonal Adjective Scale's (IAS) Cold-Quarrelsome scale, a scale assessing an orientation toward autonomy and freedom from others and from social conventions" (Wiggins & Broughton, 1985, p. 42). Autonomy has also been compared with the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI). Here PRF autonomy correlates negatively with JPI scales associated with embeddedness in the social context, such as conformity, social participation, and value orthodoxy (Jackson, 1984). Autonomy is essentially unrelated to introversion-extraversion, correlating negligibly with Costa and McCrae's (1988) measure of this dimension.

In conclusion, PRF autonomy captures the
separation facet of agency, albeit in only the interpersonal sense. Explicit accounts of the high scorer on PRF autonomy as one oriented toward separation from the social context are supported by the scale's intercorrelations with numerous theoretically-relevant variables.

**PRF Achievement.** The PRF Achievement scale measures an orientation toward self-mastery and accomplishment in a competitive interpersonal context. As such, it reflects the mastery facet of agency. Consistent with this contention, the high scorer is described as someone who "aspires to accomplish difficult tasks, maintains high standards and is willing to work toward distant goals," and "responds positively to competition" (Jackson, 1984, p. 6). The achievement trait is captured by adjectives such as capable, accomplishing, aspiring, ambitious, driving, competitive, enterprising, and self-improving. Themes of self- and other- mastery similarly prevail in the scale's actual item content. A number of items reflect an inclination to working hard toward self-set goals; this channeling or controlling of personal resources in the service of the "I's" ends provides satisfaction (sample items: "I often set goals that are very
difficult to reach"/true; "I enjoy difficult work"/true). Through self-mastery in hard work, the high achievement individual also seeks to attain mastery over others—to "climb to the top of the heap" (sample item: "My goal is to do at least a little more than anyone else has done before").

Peer rating and vocational interest data demonstrate PRF achievement's validity as a measure of agentic mastery. Self and roommate ratings on this scale correlate substantially (Paunonen, 1979). Furthermore, PRF achievement self-ratings correlate in expected directions with peer behavior ratings on mastery-related scales from the Bentler Interactive Psychological Inventory (BIPI): ambition, diligence, and leadership (Jackson, 1984). In the realm of vocation, achievement is related to career interests emphasizing academic achievement and stamina (Jackson, 1984). PRF achievement also correlates with attraction to challenging, high-status careers, such as biological scientist, chemist/physicist, and engineer (Siess & Jackson, 1967).

Convergent validity of PRF achievement has been demonstrated repeatedly. The measure correlates substantially and positively with PRF endurance, which
encompasses persistence in work, determination, and doggedness (i.e. self-mastery), and negatively with PRF play, a measure of playfulness, lightheartedness, and carefreeness (Jackson, 1984). Additionally, PRF achievement correlates positively with the IAS Ambitious-Dominant scale, which "reflects the excercise of power over others in a social context" (Wiggins & Broughton, 1985, p. 42), or other-mastery; achievement correlates negatively with an IAS scale measuring submissiveness in social interactions. PRF achievement's parity with the mastery facet of agency is probably most clearly reflected in Jackson's (1984) comparison of the scale with scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). Here, PRF achievement correlated positively and substantially with 1) two scales explicitly concerned with achievement (achievement via conformance and achievement via independence), 2) dominance, and 3) a number of scales associated with self-mastery (self-control, responsibility, and intellectual efficiency). An element of self-mastery is also reflected in achievement's positive correlation with JPI organization (Jackson, 1964).

In conclusion, PRF achievement seems a valid
measure of the mastery facet of agency, as reflected in an orientation toward accomplishment in an interpersonal context, and, to a lesser extent, in an orientation toward excercising mastery/control over others. Although it does not explicitly purport to do so, PRF achievement additionally taps some of the obsessive-compulsive aspects of self-mastery.

**PRF Dominance.** Like PRF achievement, PRF dominance measures the mastery facet of agency. Dominance differs from achievement in that it is exclusively concerned with the excercise of control/mastery over others. Jackson (1984) describes the high scorer on PRF dominance as one who "attempts to control (the) environment, and to influence or direct other people" (p. 6). Similarly, dominant people are described with trait adjectives such as controlling, commanding, governing, persuasive, forceful, directing, assertive, and powerful. Virtually all of the PRF Dominance scale's 16 items reflect agency's mastery facet. Most of the items fall under a theme of attraction toward, and enjoyment in, socially-sanctioned positions of power over others (sample items: "I would like to be a judge"/true; "I would like to be an executive with power over others"/true). The remaining items reflect a
general theme of actively controlling or persuading others (sample item: "In an argument, I can usually win others over to my side").

Self reports of PRF dominance correlate in predictable ways both with peer ratings and with vocational interests. Paunonen (1979) found self and roommate ratings on PRF dominance to correlate substantially. Self-reported PRF dominance also correlates positively with peer behavior ratings on BIPI scales connoting interpersonal mastery and social strength. For example, dominance correlates positively with leadership, ambition, extraversion, invulnerability, and masculinity (Jackson, 1984). In the realm of vocation, high-dominance men and women prefer careers which place them in a one-up position over others. PRF dominance correlates positively with interest in the following careers: high school social science teacher, personnel manager, guidance counselor, clinical psychologist, and public administrator (Siess & Jackson, 1967).

Attempts at convergent and discriminant validation further suggest PRF dominance’s construct validity as a measure of agency’s mastery facet. The scale correlates substantially with the IAS Ambitious-Dominant scale,
whose high scorers describe themselves as "forceful, assertive, dominant, and self-confident" (Wiggings & Broughton, 1985, p. 42). Themes of mastery and strength also pervade PRF dominance's correlates from the Bentler Psychological Inventory (BPI); dominance correlates substantially and positively with BPI ambition, agility, masculinity, leadership, and invulnerability (Jackson, 1984). Further examination of an initially unsettling correlation between dominance and extraversion reveals dominance to associate substantially only with the agentic facets of extraversion. Specifically, dominance correlates strongly only with assertiveness and activity facets (Costa & McCrae, 1988). Hence, PRF dominance reflects agency and drive rather than global extraversion.

Both theoretical accounts and validational efforts support PRF dominance's suitability as a measure of agency's mastery facet. In particular, PRF dominance seems to tap the facet's interpersonal aspect—mastery as an orientation toward controlling others.

Measures of Communion

TAT Intimacy Motivation. McAdams (1979) has developed a measure of the intimacy facet of communion, TAT-assessed intimacy motivation, that is explicitly
derived from Bakan's (1966) conceptualization of communion. The intimacy motive is defined as "a recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of warm, close, and communicative exchange" (McAdams, 1988b, p. 77). As such, it represents an orientation to dyadic interpersonal relationships characterized by reciprocal self disclosure: one's innermost self is surrendered or offered to another, and reciprocally, the other is warmly received through careful listening. Validational research expands on the intimacy motive's meaning and illustrates its suitability as a measure of communion's intimacy facet. For example, McAdams and Constantian (1983) collected TAT stories from 50 college students and then randomly paged them seven times daily for one week. Upon each paging, subjects described what they were doing and what they were thinking about. Intimacy motivation correlated positively and substantially with percent of interpersonal episodes spent in conversation/letter-writing. Although one might argue that motives other than intimacy can certainly underlie a single given conversation, conversation in general is defined by reciprocal exchange and as such is a prime behavioral exemplar of the intimacy facet. Additionally, intimacy motivation
correlated positively and substantially with percentage of interpersonally-oriented thoughts and correlated negatively with percentage of interacting episodes in which subjects wished to be alone or not interacting.

McAdams and Powers (1981) gathered further evidence that intimacy motivation captures a thematic clustering in thought centered around communion's intimacy facet. Here, 43 college students were asked to structure their own psychodramas in groups of eight or nine. Intimacy motivation firstly correlated substantially with the presence of themes of intimacy in the psychodramas that individual subjects produced—themes of reciprocal dialogue, surrender of control, and positive affect. Secondly, intimacy motivation correlated positively with discrete behaviors indicative of merger, such as physical proximity behavior and "we" references. Finally, intimacy motivation correlated positively with peer ratings on adjectives suggestive of a communal social presentation of self: sincere, loving, and likeable. Intimacy motivation correlated negatively with peer ratings on dominance.

A number of additional studies attest to intimacy motivation's validity and breadth as a measure of the intimacy facet. McAdams, Jackson, and Kirshnit (1984)
coded videotaped, open-ended interviews conducted on college undergraduates for nonverbal behaviors indicative of a warm interpersonal orientation. As predicted, high intimacy subjects spent a higher percentage of their interview engaged in eye contact, smiling, and laughing, all nonverbal behaviors aimed at maintaining contact and/or bolstering a sense of shared experience and warmth. Additionally, content analysis of subjects' interview accounts of friendship episodes revealed a strong correlation between intimacy motivation and two prime reflections of the intimacy facet: self disclosure with friends and adopting the listener role with friends. Intimacy motivation has additionally been shown to relate to information processing: high intimacy individuals are selectively attentive to communion-related facial cues (McAdams, 1979) and selectively recall episodic memories tinged with communal interpersonal themes (McAdams, 1982b). Finally, McAdams and Vaillant (1982) found intimacy motivation to predict adult males' marital satisfaction 17 years after motive assessment.

In conclusion, the intimacy motive captures communion's intimacy facet both theoretically and empirically. Intimacy motivation reflects a thematic
clustering characterized by mutual self disclosure--by reciprocal sharing with another of that which is in most. This clustering organizes the overt behaviors, ideational life, information processing, and personal relationships of those scoring high on the motive.

Communal Orientation and Self Disclosure. Two additional constructs that tap into communion's intimacy facet are communal orientation and self-disclosure. Mills and Clark (1982) define communal orientation, which is assessed by the Communal Orientation Scale (COS), as a disposition to communal relationships; such relationships reflect a mutuality, where people invest in one another, as reflected in empathy, concern, and reciprocal helping. Clark, Oellette, Powell, and Milberg (1987) describe the communally-oriented person thusly:

(They) presumably feel responsible for the other's welfare. They desire and/or feel obligated to benefit the other person when he or she has a need. They may also benefit the other person simply to please and to show a general concern for his or her welfare. In addition they expect the other person to be responsive to their needs and to demonstrate concern for their welfare. (p. 94)

Several actors attest to communal orientation's correspondence to communion's intimacy facet. Firstly, the COS's actual items explicitly embrace intimacy-based
themes of empathic concern for another's experience (sample item: "I'm not especially sensitive to other people's feelings"/false) and sharing of one's inner self (sample item: "People should keep their troubles to themselves"/false). Communal orientation also correlates positively with two constructs reflecting interpersonal commitment and openness: social responsibility and emotional empathy (Clark et al., 1987). Additionally, Clark et al. (1987) have carried out an initial validational study of their construct. Here subjects were led by a confederate to believe that the experimenter was in either a sad or a neutral mood. Subjects were next exposed to the experimenter, who solicited their help in a notecard alphabetizing task, emphasizing that this was not part of the experiment. The experimenter next left the participant alone with the notecards. As predicted, high-communal subjects alphabetized significantly more notecards than low-communal subjects, and furthermore, experimenter sadness tended to increase helping among high-communal subjects but not among low-communal subjects. In summary, the COS accurately captures communion's intimacy facet as reflected in themes of giving of oneself and receiving of other.
A third construct tapping into the intimacy facet is self disclosure. As previously noted, this construct embraces the core of intimacy: in self disclosing, the individual removes self-other separations, sharing with another what was previously withheld. Through this sharing, the openness and union which is the goal of communion is sought. Due to the combination of limited testing time and the unavailability of a short, well-validated measure of self disclosure, a face-valid yet unresearched scale, the Self Disclosure Scale (SDS) will be employed. On this measure, the test-taker rates the extent to which he/she has shared 11 aspects of the withheld, vulnerable self (sample item: "One of the biggest disappointments in my life;" "What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply") with a romantic partner or closest friend.

**PRF Affiliation.** While intimacy motivation, communal orientation, and self disclosure all tap the intimacy facet of communion, PRF affiliation reflects its social embeddedness facet. The affiliative individual is one oriented toward open, cooperative, and friendly relationships with the social group. Jackson (1984) describes the high scorer on the PRF Affiliation scale as one who makes efforts to establish and maintain
associations with others and as one who "enjoys being with friends and people in general" (p. 6). The trait, affiliation, is defined by adjectives connoting an orientation toward maintaining social connections/interpersonal contacts—adjectives such as neighborly, warm, friendly, good-natured, gregarious, cooperative, sociable, good-willed, and hospitable. Prevailing themes in the scale's actual item content also suggest social embeddedness. The majority of items fall under a theme of need for social contact/dependence on the group (sample items: "When I see someone at a distance, I don't go out of my way to say hello"/false; "I try to be in the company of friends as much as possible"/true), while the remaining items reflect a sociable self image (sample item: "Sometimes I have to make a real effort to be sociable"/false).

Studies focusing both on peer ratings and on vocational interests support the validity of PRF affiliation as a measure of social embeddedness. Self-reported PRF affiliation, for example, correlates strongly with roommate reports of PRF affiliation (Paunonen, 1979). Furthermore, affiliation correlates positively with peer ratings of cheerfulness, extraversion, and trustfulness (Jackson, 1984). As
would be expected, affiliative individuals tend to prefer vocations emphasizing interpersonal contact, while eschewing more solitary, noninterpersonal careers. Siess and Jackson (1967), for example, found PRF affiliation to correlate positively with interest in vocations of YMCA secretary, high school social science teacher, and YMCA physical education director; PRF affiliation correlated negatively with interests in more solitary vocations of architect, artist, and author. In a similar study, PRF affiliation correlated positively with vocational preferences for social service (males only), human relations management, and professional advising (Jackson, 1984).

Assays on PRF affiliation's convergent and discriminant validity reveal a measure that clearly taps communion's social embeddedness facet but also taps some aspects of dominance, albeit to a lesser extent. Affiliation correlates substantially and positively with the IAS Gregarious-Extraverted scale, which reflects a disposition "to actively seek-out settings and situations that will permit harmonious interactions with others" (Wiggins & Broughton, 1985, p. 44). Social embeddedness is similarly suggested by the affiliation scale's generally strong correlations with warmth
and gregariousness facets of extraversion (Costa & McCrae, 1988), 2) sociability, communality, and femininity scales of the CPI (Jackson, 1984), and 3) JPI social participation and interpersonal affect (Jackson, 1984). Unfortunately, PRF affiliation also seems to tap some agentic aspects of interpersonal orientation. Affiliation correlates moderately with both CPI and PRF measures of dominance (Jackson, 1984). Indeed, friendly, sociable qualities can serve the ends of power, of building alliances, as well as those of social connection (Winter & Stewart, 1978). Additionally, PRF affiliation relates to JPI self esteem (Jackson, 1984).

In conclusion, PRF affiliation clearly embraces communion in the sense of social embeddedness. This scale is, however, somewhat less "clean" than other PRF scales discussed. In addition to communion, PRF affiliation captures aspects of interpersonal mastery and confidence, though to a secondary degree. The Operant-Respondent Distinction

At this point, the various agency/communion measures employed in the present study have been differentiated as to the construct facets that they tap. One additional point of differentiation between these
measures involves McClelland's (1980) operant-respondent distinction. Operant measures are analogous to projective tests and typically assess motives, while respondent measures are analogous to self-report questionnaires and typically assess traits, values, and schemas. Furthermore, "operant and respondent measures" of the same general content area (ex: TAT affiliation motive and PRF self-report affiliation) "generally do not correlate with each other" (McClelland, 1980, p. 12). McClelland cites two related reasons for this failure to correlate. First, the two types of measures create different response sets in the test-taker, and second, they "tap theoretically distinct aspects of personality" (McClelland, 1980, p. 15). Respondent measures constrain the test taker by specifying the stimulus (ex: a specific self-statement, like, "I rely on other people") and the response (ex: agree/disagree). Furthermore, respondent measures typically ask for statements of how the subject generally feels or generally is: respondent measures pull for "a consistent, generalized account of self," engendering "consistency and social desireability sets" (McClelland, 1980, p. 36). Consequent to this set pattern, respondents invoke self reflection, measuring aspects of
the conscious self-picture, or what McClelland calls attitudes, schemas, and values.

Operant measures, on the other hand, do not constrain the test-taker's providing no specific stimulus, or test question, and no specific response. Rather than responding to the test, the test-taker operates on the test. While respondent measures create consistency and social desireability sets, operant measures, for example TAT motive measures, create variability sets with instructions emphasizing imagination and creativity rather than uniformity. On operant measures, subjects "are not; being asked to conceptualize or make judgements about their behavior" (McClelland, 1980, p. 12); instead they are simply asked to behave. In other words, where respondent measures tap aspects of one's conscious, self-reflective view of oneself (i.e. personality taken as object by ego), operant measures tap the often less-conscious aspects of personality that drive us when we are not self-monitoring.

The operant-respondent distinction differentiates the facet measures of agency/communion: TAT power and intimacy measures are operant measures, while all PRF scales, COS, and SDS are clearly respondent measures.
Hence, measures purportedly tapping the same content area, specifically TAT power/PRF dominance and TAT intimacy/COS-SDS, are now differentiated (see Tables 1-2). It is at this time also worth noting that the measures of personality style and openness to experience to be reviewed in the next section are respondent measures.

Some clarification is called for regarding McClelland's contention that operant and respondent measures tap different aspects or levels of personality. For McClelland (1980), operant measures tap less-conscious motives, and respondent measures tap more-conscious traits. It is the position of the present author that McClelland's association of specific cause constructs with different degrees of consciousness is errant: more-conscious traits can just as easily be conceived of as more-conscious motives, and less-conscious motives can be conceived of as less-conscious traits. Taken by itself, however, McClelland's less-conscious/more-conscious distinction is worth noting. Orientations can be more or less conscious, and conscious and unconscious orientations can be in relative conflict or relative harmony. Along these lines, given that the personality style and openness measures to be
employed are respondent in nature, we would expect an invocation of conscious self-reflection in the answering of their items. To the degree that more-conscious and less-conscious orientations are at odds, less-conscious orientation, as measured by operant TAT intimacy and power measures, will not be expressed in responses to respondent measures.

**Summary: Classification of Measures**

Agency and communion can each be reduced to three central facets or themes: separation, mastery, and denial, and social embeddedness, intimacy, and inner receptivity, respectively. Conceptually, these facets reflect intrapsychic as well as interpersonal aspects of agency and communion. All three of agency's facets have intrapsychic connotations, while two, separation and mastery, have equally salient interpersonal connotations. Two of communion's facets, social embeddedness and intimacy, are interpersonal in nature, while communion's third facet, inner receptivity, is exclusively intrapsychic. While agentic and communal orientations subsume inner and outer senses, theory and research behind facet measures of the constructs, with the exception of PRF achievement, addresses only agency/communion's interpersonal aspects, linking
agency/communion-like constructs to interpersonal behavior, interpersonal themes in thought, aspects of relationships, vocational interests, and peer ratings of interpersonal behavior. In conclusion, the measures employed in this study, with the exception of PRF achievement, purport to measure agency and communion in their interpersonal senses only.

The facet measures employed in the present study can be differentiated both in terms of the agency or communion facets they tap and in terms of the operant-respondent distinction (see Tables 1 and 2). Regarding agency, power motivation, PRF dominance, and PRF achievement all capture the mastery facet, while PRF autonomy captures the separation facet. While the three PRF measures are respondents, power motivation is operant. Three of the four communion measures used, intimacy motivation, COS, and SDS, all reflect the intimacy facet: the fourth measure employed, PRF affiliation, represents the social embeddedness facet. All of these communion facet measures are respondent, save intimacy motivation, which is operant.

The present chapter sought to clarify the constructs of agency and communion in terms of theory and measurement. In the next two chapters, we turn to
Table 1

**Classification of Agency Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operant</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAT power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>PRF autonomy</td>
<td>PRF dominance</td>
<td>PRF achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Classification of Communion Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Embeddedness</th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
<th>Inner Receptivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operant</td>
<td>PRF affiliation</td>
<td>TAT intimacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>COS</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


personality style and openness to experience, two comprehensive constructs that, like agency and communion, reflect orientations to inner and outer worlds.
CHAPTER III
PERSONALITY STYLE

Millon (1967) has developed a system of personality classification that consists of eight basic personality styles. Personality is defined as "a personally distinctive way of coping with others and relating to ourselves" (Millon, 1981, p. 5). As such, each of Millon's eight patterns reflects relatively enduring and far-reaching traits that characterize the individual's ways of behaving, perceiving, feeling, thinking, and relating to others (Millon, 1983). Personality style subsumes both interpersonal and intrapsychic orientations. It is noteworthy here that these styles do not in themselves address questions of psychological normality or pathology: any one of these styles can be adaptive or maladaptive depending upon the individual's ability to apply the pattern in a flexible and discerning, rather than rigid and insensitive, manner tailored to the demands of reality. Despite the nonevaluative nature of Millon's styles, they are nevertheless described in terms of abnormality. This is for the purpose of DISTINCTION. In a discussion of
these matters Millon (1981) states, "most personalities behave 'normally' most of the time ... what a text such as this seeks to stress are those features that, by virtue of their frequency and intensity, distinguish certain personalities" (p. 254). As testament to the applicability of Millon's "pathology-distinguished" personality styles to normal populations, Checa (personal communication, June 17, 1988) has found 95% of all individuals who take Millon's personality measure (the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory) to get an elevation on at least one of the eight styles. Following are descriptions of the eight patterns.

**Schizoid Style**

The five defining traits of the schizoid personality pattern are affectivity deficit, interpersonal indifference, mild cognitive slippage, behavioral apathy, and perceptual insensitivity (Millon, 1983). Regarding the first of these traits, the schizoid personality exhibits a pervasive emotional blandness—an inability to experience deep personal feelings of anger, sadness, joy, surprise, anxiety, etc. This blandness represents an intrinsic psychological quality, rather than the product of agentic denial of an otherwise blooming emotional life. The schizoid individual also
shies from communion with others, reporting minimal interpersonal interests and preferring a peripheral, odd-man-out social role. In summary, schizoid personalities' interpersonal aloofness may often be interpreted by others as signs of hostility and rejection. In fact it merely represents a fundamental incapacity to sense the moods and needs which others experience. These individuals are unfeeling, then, not by intention or for self-protective reasons but because they possess an emotional blandness and interpersonal insensitivity. (Millon, 1974, p. 220).

The remaining three schizoid traits of perceptual insensitivity, mild cognitive slippage, and behavioral apathy all represent what might called an agency deficit. At the perceptual level, the schizoid individual fails to "attend, select, and regulate (his/her) perceptions of the environment" (Millon, 1981, p. 285); in other words, the schizoid fails to agentically impose structure upon incoming stimulus information. Furthermore, this disinclination to process information actively, to organize and make-sense-of, leads to cognitive slippage--"a vagueness and impoverishment of thought and a tendency to skim the surface of events" (Millon, 1974, p. 220). Schizoids similarly evidence agency deficits in the behavioral realm. Specifically, schizoids are apathetic, or low in
drive, and it is difficult to identify any burning goal "in their generally feeble hierarchy of motives" (Millon, 1961, p. 285).

In conclusion, the LL configuration seems to capture Millon's schizoid personality pattern and is hypothesized to relate to it. Schizoid personalities largely avoid communion with inner and outer worlds. Furthermore, this avoidance springs not from agentic attempts to separate, master, or deny, but from an intrinsic communal deficit. Such individuals also evidence a lack of agency in 1) their failure to fully and actively process information and 2) being "content to remain aloof from the social aspirations and competitiveness they see in others" (Millon, 1981, p. 285).

Avoidant Style

The hallmark of the avoidant person is a simultaneous desire for interpersonal contact/affection and a fear of such contact. Millon (1974) writes:

Avoidant personalities are beset by conflict. They cannot act on their own because of marked self-doubt. On the other hand, they cannot depend on others because of social mistrust. Positive reinforcements cannot be obtained from themselves or others: both sources provide only pain and discomfort. (p. 228)

Hence, at the center of the avoidant personality are
equally negative views of self and of other; others are experienced as critical, devaluing, and humiliating, and self is experienced as worthless, incompetent, and contemptible. Consequently, normal leanings toward intrapsychic and interpersonal communion are over-ruled by fears of unbearable psychic pain and personal attack. In turn, these fears of the communal lead to agentic behaviors. On the internal front, the avoidant personality denies and represses feelings and impulses, elements which if expressed could lead to personal pain and perhaps evince the criticism of others; on the external front, avoidant personalities separate themselves from the interpersonal context in order to avoid feared derogation.

In summary, then, avoidant dynamics are motivated by fears of communion rather than by an orientation toward agency or communion. Although this fear of communion leads to some agentic-like postures, this is not a "pure" form of agency: avoidant personalities separate self from environment and affect more to avoid communion-related fears than for the sake of agency-related goals. Consequent to these considerations, no hypotheses are advanced for this personality pattern.

Dependent Style

The dependent personality pattern is captured by
five central traits: inadequate self-images' interpersonal submissiveness, initiative deficit, pacific temperament, and pollyanna cognitive style (Millon, 1983). The dependent personality is characterized by an immersion in the interpersonal context. Such individuals typically have inadequate self images, seeing themselves as largely incompetent to meet the demands of adult life or to responsibly direct their own behaviors. Consequently, they evidence an interpersonal submissiveness, where the direction of a stronger, nurturing figure is craved; when such ego functions are not provided by the external interpersonal context, the dependent personality feels anxious and helpless. Millon (1981) summarizes dependent individuals' situation thusly:

As they see it, only others possess the requisite talents and experience to attain the rewards of life. Given these attitudes, they conclude it best to abdicate self-responsibility, to leave matters to others, and to place their fate in others' hands. Others are so much better equipped to shoulder responsibilities, to navigate the intricacies of a complex world, and to discover and achieve the pleasures to be found in the competitions of life. (p. 114)

Viewed extraspectively, the dependent person's state of affairs appears in an initiative deficit, where self-assertion and autonomy are avoided.
Given the dependent individual’s reliance upon relationships with others for the provision of basic ego functions, the maintenance of these relationships becomes of crucial importance. To aid in this maintenance, the dependent person adopts a pacific temperament and a pollyanna cognitive style. Specifically, these typically considerate and affectionate people tend to avoid behaviors on their part that might lead to interpersonal conflict (i.e., loss of external ego). Similarly interpersonal difficulties tend to be cognitively smoothed-over, or selectively unattended-to.

"To achieve their goals," then, "dependent personalities learn to attach themselves to others, to submerge their individuality, to deny points of difference, to avoid expressions of power, and to ask for little more than acceptance and support" (Millon, 1981, p. 114). In other words, the dependent individual embraces communion while shunning agency. The similarity between Milton’s account of the dependent pattern and the LH pattern, as embodied in Kegan’s interpersonal balance stage is obvious: basically, both theorists paint a picture of an embedded individual who is his/her interpersonal relationships rather than
having such relationships. The dependent pattern, in light of these considerations, is hypothesized to relate to the LH configuration.

**Histrionic Style**

Like the dependent, the histrionic personality lacks a core sense of identity, relying on others to provide a sense of self and self-esteem. Hence, histrionics "describe themselves not in terms of their own traits but in terms of their relationships, and behave like 'empty organisms' who react more to external stimuli than to promptings from within" (Millon, 1981, p. 140). Unlike the dependent, however, the histrionic adopts an ACTIVE strategy for securing craved support. Indeed, an active, gregarious coloring pervades two central histrionic traits of sociable self-image and interpersonal seductiveness. Histrionic individuals tend to see themselves as social magnets--stimulating, charming, sociable people who attract others. Viewed from the outside, the histrionic personality appears interpersonally seductive, turning to dramatic, exhibitionistic behaviors in an ongoing attempt to gain approval.

The three other core histrionic traits of fickle affectivity, immature stimulus-seeking behavior, and
cognitive dissociation all stem from the histrionic's relative inability to separate from, or objectify, the internal context of affect, impulse, and thought. In Bakan's terms, the histrionic evidences a deficit in ego mastery. Consequent to this deficit, the histrionic is prone to dramatic, short-lived effusions of affect and impulse; rather than being owned or held (i.e., fleshed-out with personal associations and given personal weight), these emanations from within are simply expressed. Similarly, this tendency to underorganize results in erratic, flighty thinking and an "impoverishment of inner richness and depth" (Millon, 1981, p. 141).

In summary, the histrionic's functioning on both interpersonal and intrapsychic fronts is characterized by communal overtones and a lack of agency. Beneath histrionic individuals' social affability "lies an intense need for attention and affection. They require constant affirmation of approval and acceptance" and "are vulnerable to the moods and attitudes of those on whom they depend" (Millon, 1981, p. 131). The histrionic also exhibits a tendency to commune with the inner world with no accompanying tendency to master it or impose organization upon it. Given these
considerations, the histrionic pattern is hypothesized to relate to the LH configuration.

Narcissistic Style

The narcissistic personality pattern is captured by the following five traits: inflated self-image, interpersonal exploitiveness, deficient social conscience, cognitive expansiveness, and insouciant temperament (Millon, 1983). Most centrally, the narcissistic personality has an inflated self-image. Narcissists in short feel themselves to be extra-special individuals. Consequent to their imagined superiority, they believe that they transcend the social context: narcissists see themselves as being quite separate from and "above" the interpersonal world.

This self-satisfied pulling-away from the social context lends a distinctly noncommunal slant to the narcissistic interpersonal orientation. First, the narcissist is interpersonally exploitive, failing to embrace open exchange or mutuality. Instead, the narcissist "takes others for granted and uses them to enhance self and indulge desires" (Millon, 1983, p. 4). Second, narcissistic personalities exhibit what Millon calls a deficient social conscience. Here conventions and rules of society are viewed as inapplicable to self,
as the narcissist reveals a careless disregard for personal integrity and an indifference to the rights of others. In particular, these people ignore the tacit social conventions of objectivity or veracity, displaying a cognitive expansiveness: the narcissist evidences minimal constraint by objective reality, bending facts and often lying to maintain the bliss of self-sureness. Finally, the narcissistic personality's immunity from attachment or embeddedness is reflected in an insouciant temperament. In short, the narcissist transcends the affective concomittants of interpersonal interaction, showing a general imperturbability.

Narcissists, in short, fully embrace Bakan's (1966) agentic theme of separation. Believing they are superior, narcissists generally disengage themselves from and disdain people, social conventions, and shared reality/objectivity. Narcissists are islands unto themselves. Along these lines, Millon (1981) notes, "Narcissists need depend on no one else to provide gratification; there is always themselves to keep them warm" (p. 169). The narcissistic pattern is, in light of these considerations, hypothesized to relate to the HL configuration.
Aggressive Style

If the narcissistic pattern is captured by the agentic theme of separation, the aggressive pattern is surely captured by agentic themes of mastery and denial. To understand aggressive personalities one must understand their world view. Millon (1981) writes:

If we accept their premise that ours is a dog-eat-dog world, we can understand why they value being tough, forthright, and unsentimental...To them, the only way to survive in this world is to dominate and control it. (p. 200)

The aggressive personality's espousal of this world view is reflected in a combination of assertive self-image and interpersonal vindictiveness: such people proudly revel in their individuality and in a "competitive, power-oriented lifestyle" (Millon, 1983, p. 4). "Driven by a desire to dominate and humiliate others" (Millon, 1981, p. 202), the aggressive personality gains real satisfaction in attaining mastery over others through assertion, intimidation, and derogation. Similarly, intimate feelings, social cooperativeness, and the like are devalued as traits for the weak. While agentic mastery characterizes aggressive personalities' orientations to interpersonal world, agentic denial characterizes their orientation to the intrapsychic realm. Most of these individuals repress their hostile
and vengeful attitudes. This repression results in malevolent projections, where what cannot be accepted in oneself is attributed to others. Additionally, as Bakan would predict, by ruling-out hostile affects/impulses, the aggressive personality paradoxically becomes prone to eruptions of hostility and aggressive behavior. In fact, "a pugnacious and irascible temper which flares readily into argument and attack" (Millon, 1983, p. 4) is a defining trait of the aggressive personality.

In conclusion, the aggressive personality pattern embraces both mastering and denying aspects of agency while rejecting communal concerns. The aggressive pattern is, as such, hypothesized to relate to the HL configuration.

Compulsive Style

A central, motivating "force behind the behavior of compulsives is their fear of disapproval and concern that their actions will be frowned upon and punished" (Millon, 1981, p. 228). A concomittant motivating concern is the fear that they will lose control of themselves—that feelings and impulses unacceptable to themselves and to others will slip-out. From these two fears emanate the compulsive personality's hallmark
preoccupation with self-control.

Indeed, themes of self-control pervade and unify Millon's (1983) five central compulsive traits of conscientious self-image, cognitive constriction, restrained affectivity, behavioral rigidity, and interpersonal respectfulness. Compulsives pride themselves on their self-discipline, rationality, organization, meticulousness, and dependability. More than anything else they crave self-mastery. Unfortunately, the compulsive must contend with ongoing intrapsychic emanations, in the form of thoughts, affects, and impulses, which challenge the regime of order. In handling them, the compulsive firstly insulates himself/herself from the novel by adopting a rigid cognitive set of fixed expectations, rules, and regulations. Furthermore, affects are largely denied. Millon (1981) writes, "not daring to expose their true feelings of defiance and anger, they ... bind these feelings so tightly that their opposite comes forth" (p. 228). In fending-off impulse, the compulsive firstly sticks to tightly-controlled patterns of behavior; in Bakan's terms, compulsive personalities evidence the repetition compulsion that is associated with agentic denial. Compulsive individuals' characteristic
interpersonal respectfulness, a tendency toward formality and politeness in interpersonal relationships, also serves to isolate them from spontaneous impulses to action.

In conclusion, the compulsive personality pattern embraces agency in the sense of mastery--specifically, self-mastery. Communal themes of open interpersonal exchange or experiential spontaneity are additionally preempted by adherence to convention and rigid self-control. Given these factors, the compulsive pattern is hypothesized to relate to the HL configuration.

Passive-Aggressive Style

Unlike most of the other personality patterns we have reviewed, the passive-aggressive pattern reflects a lack of commitment to some personality strategy, rather than an overcommitment. Passive-aggressive individuals' difficulties "stem not from the rigid character of their coping style but from its exaggerated fluidity" (Millon, 1981, p. 257). Specifically, passive-aggressive individuals have neither the interest nor the ability to separate themselves from the welter of their passing emotions, or to impose order on their lives. Rather than having or owning impulses and affects, they are their
impulses and affects. Viewed from the outside, this intrapsychic state of affairs is reflected in cardinal passive-aggressive traits of labile affectivity, behavioral contrariness, and interpersonal ambivalence.

Unlike the dependent personality, passive-aggressive personalities do not turn to a consistent communal solution to escape their immersion in affect and impulse: just as they refuse to commit to self-control, they are also unwilling to attach to an external provider of ego functions. In short, they "vacillate and cannot decide whether to be dependent or independent of others and whether to respond to events actively or passively" (Millon, 1981, p. 257). The passive-aggressive pattern, then, clearly reflects a failure to commit to agentic and/or communal orientations. Hence, the pattern is hypothesized to relate to the LL configuration. For a summary of the hypotheses advanced in this chapter, see Table 3.
Table 3

Hypothesized Relations Between Agency/Communion Configuration and Personality Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Communion</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>dependent style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>histrionic style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schizoid</td>
<td>narcissistic aggressive compulsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passive-aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE

Openness to experience is defined as a "broad dimension of personality' manifested in a rich fantasy life, aesthetic sensitivity, awareness of inner feelings, need for variety in actions, intellectual curiosity, and liberal value systems" (McCrae & Costa, 1985, p. 145). As such openness is a general orientation toward engaging in spontaneous experience, transcending more circumscribed realms such as feeling or action.

Our understanding of this relatively new construct is amplified through a perusal of major attempts at establishing convergent validity. First, openness to experience is strongly related to "openness to absorbing and self-altering experiences, or Absorption" (McCrae & Costa, 1985, p. 160). Absorption, which encompasses fantasy absorptions' reality absorption, dissociation, devotion-trust, and autonomy-criticality (Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974), connotes an intentionally mediated, and controlled engagement in emotional and fantasy life— in emanations from the unconscious. In fact, absorption is
related to hypnotic susceptibility, a sine qua non of voluntary, intentional suspension of self-mastery, or adaptive regression (Grunewald, Fromm, & Oberlander, 1979). Similarly, absorption implies an intentional receptivity to emanations from without, in the form of the raw information of the senses. These considerations clarify the nature of openness to experience. The lay term, openness', connotations of passivity, uncriticality, or undefendedness do not apply to openness to experience. Instead, openness in this context suggests an intentional, active seeking-of and receptivity-to internal and external experience (McCrae & Costa, 1985).

As with the research on openness and absorption, research linking openness to attitudes and values both validates and clarifies the openness construct. Openness correlates moderately with leanings toward aesthetic values and away from economic/political's or conventional, values (Costa & McCrae, 1977, 1978). For McCrae and Costa (1985), the directions of these correlations attest to the open individual's leaning away from unquestioning acceptance of societal values and toward basing values on the information of the senses. Similarly, Costa and McCrae (1978) have found
openness to correlate negatively with adherence to the traditional family ideology that facilitates the development of authoritarian personalities (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levison, & Sanford, 1950). McCrae and Costa (1985) interpret the general moderateness of openness-value correlations as evidence that openness itself is not merely a circumscribed value or attitude. Along these lines, they note:

What the correlations of openness with values and attitudes probably show is more a matter of influence than identity. Attitudes and values are not themselves a part of an enduring personality structure; but they reflect the influence of personality, and especially of openness. What remains the same is a willingness to reconsider and either reaffirm or reject old values.

(McCrae & Costa, 1985, p. 163)

Finally, convergent validation has also been sought in comparisons between openness to experience and vocational interests. First, open individuals tend toward occupational interests that embrace openness: on a vocational interest inventory, open individuals endorsed a disproportionately large number of artistic and investigative careers, such as anthropologist, author, independent research scientist, and playwright, and a small number of more conventional careers (Costa, McCrae, & Holland, 1984). Additionally, Costa and McCrae (1980) found openness to correlate positively
with retrospective reports of career change in middle-aged males. A subsequent replication of this study established the temporal priority of openness: openness in middle-aged men and women at time one predicted career change two years later (McCrae & Costa, 1985).

Theoretical statements and empirical findings that discriminate openness from other constructs further clarify the nature of openness, and hence, warrant mention. First, openness to experience is distinct from notions of psychological health or intelligence. Openness to experience is unrelated to mental health, at least when mental health is narrowly defined as an absence of painful emotional experiences, or neuroticism. For example, a recent study found openness and neuroticism to correlate at $r = -0.01$ (McCrae & Costa, 1985). Instead, openness implies a receptivity to both positive and negative feelings. Openness is also not equivalent to intelligence: in a joint factor analysis of openness facet scales and scales of the Army Alpha intelligence test, no openness facet scales loaded onto the well-defined intelligence factor that emerged (McCrae & Costa, 1985).

Openness to experience is theoretically distinct
from notions of interpersonal openness and social introversion-extraversion as well as from intelligence and mental health. McCrae and Costa assert experiential openness to be unrelated to interpersonal openness, as reflected in self disclosure. "Because they attend to their own inner states and reflect on their ideas and beliefs, experientially open people may have more to disclose...But there is no evidence that they are especially disposed to share their ideas or feelings" (McCrae & Costa, 1985, p. 152). Openness to experience also does not imply introversion; while open individuals do think more about themselves, they also think more about the external world. Empirical support for the distinctness of openness from extraversion-introversion comes from findings of the Normative Aging Study (NAS). Here McCrae and Costa (1980) found a sentence completion measure of openness to be essentially unrelated to extraversion.

Although openness at first glance seems to be a variant on Bakan's communion (i.e. receptivity to inner and outer worlds, a lack of repression, etc.), this construct upon closer examination also connotes agency. Specifically, openness seems related to individuality, separation from convention, and autonomy, as well as
receptivity. Costa and McCrae (1988) in fact have recently found openness to correlate diminutively yet significantly with PRF autonomy, dominance, and achievement. In light of this lack of clarity, no specific hypotheses regarding openness to experience's relation to agency/communion configurations are advanced.
CHAPTER V

METHOD

Subjects

A sample of 96 undergraduate students was studied. All subjects were students in an introductory psychology course at a medium-sized midwestern university. Subjects received class credit in exchange for their participation. Two subjects in this overall sample were eliminated due to invalid MCMI profiles. Of the remaining 94 subjects, 72 (77%) were female and 22 (23%) were male.

Procedure

Subjects were run in groups of 15-20 in a single session lasting 1-1/2 hours. In all sessions the same, single experimenter was present. At the beginning of the session, subjects were instructed, "You will be taking a number of psychological measures today." After 1) reading and signing a statement of informed consent and 2) entering their age and gender on a demographics sheet, subjects were administered the TAT power and intimacy measures (group format) (McAdams, 1979; Winter, 1973). This consists of 6 pictures projected on a
screen for 15 seconds each. After each picture, subjects had 5 minutes to write an imaginative story based on the picture.

Upon completion of the TAT, all subjects were given the following test battery, along with the instructions, "You will have the remainder of the session to complete this packet." At the end of the session, subjects were appropriately debriefed.

The test battery consisted of the following measures, listed in order of their appearance in the packet:

1. **Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI)**. A 142-item self-report inventory assessing the presence of Millon's (1983) 8 basic personality styles: schizoid, avoidant, dependent, histrionic, narcissistic, aggressive, compulsive, and passive-aggressive. Inventory items take the form of self statements which the test-taker endorses as "true" or "false" (sample items: "I very often say things quickly that I regret having said;" "I have many ideas that are ahead of the times"). In addition to items tapping the 8 personality styles, the inventory includes 4 validity items that serve as a quick check for blatant misrepresentation (sample item: "I have not seen a car in the last ten
years"). The inventory used was extracted from the larger, 175-item MCMI, which assess a number of additional factors irrelevant to the present study.

Numerous studies conducted on psychiatric populations suggest the MCMI to be psychometrically sound. Internal consistency estimates based on Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 range from .86 to .93 for the eight personality style scales employed (Millon, 1987). Test-retest reliability coefficients for the 8 scales range from .81 to .91, over a 5 to 9 day lag, and from .77 to .85 over a 4 to 6 week delay (Millon, 1983). As it is typically employed as an aid to clinical diagnosis, validity data on the MCMI involves comparisons between scale elevations and independent clinical judgements. Positive predictive power percentages for the 8 MCMI scales employed in this study range from .64 to .79 (Millon, 1987): between 64 and 79 percent of the psychiatric patients falling above the cutting line for one of the 8 scales are independently diagnosed with the personality disorder relevant to that scale. Negative predictive power percentages for the 8 scales span from .93 to .97 (Millon, 1987). Only 3% to 7% of the psychiatric patients falling below the cutting line for a given MCMI scale are diagnosed as having the
personality disorder relevant to that scale.

2. **Personality Research Form (PRF).** A 64-item self-report inventory (true-false) with scales assessing four "personality traits broadly relevant to the functioning of individuals in a wide variety of situations" (Jackson, 1984, p. 4): achievement (sample item: "I seldom set standards which are difficult for me to reach"), autonomy (sample item: "I could live alone and enjoy it"), dominance (sample item: "I am quite effective in getting others to agree with me"), and affiliation (sample item: "I choose hobbies that I can share with other people"). The first three scales tap various facets of agency, and the latter assesses the social embeddedness facet of communion. The items used were taken from the larger, 352-item PRF (Jackson, 1984), which measures a number of additional traits irrelevant to this study.

The PRF scales employed have adequate psychometric properties. Internal consistency for the four scales ranges from .57 to .86 for college students (Jackson, 1984). In evaluating these somewhat low reliability values it is important to remember that the PRF scales "are balanced to control for acquiescent responding" and desirability "and are the product of an extensive and
sophisticated scale development program" (Costa & McCrae, 1988, p. 260): in comparison with the internal consistency values reported for many other personality scales, PRF consistency values are relatively impervious to the inflating effects of social desirability and acquiescence (Jackson, 1984). Test-retest reliabilities for the four scales range from .77 to .86, over a one-week interval (Bentler, 1964). As already cited, these four scales have been validated against peer ratings, vocational interests, and other questionnaire measures.

3. Communal Orientation Scale (COS). A scale consisting of 14 self-descriptive statements (sample item: "When I have a need, I turn to others I know for help"). Subjects are instructed to read each of these statements and then rate the degree to which it characterizes them on a scale from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 5 (extremely characteristic). The scale, which assesses communion's intimacy facet, yields a single score representing the individual's orientation toward communal interpersonal exchange (Clark et al., 1987).

This recently developed measure evidences adequate reliability. A Cronbach's Alpha of .78 was obtained on
a sample of 561 college students. The COS's test-restest reliability has been computed at .68 over an 11 week lag, using Winer's (1971) intraclass correlation (Clark et al., 1987). Item-total (with item deleted) correlations additionally indicate that the COS's 14 items are not overly redundant with each other, ranging from, .23 - .50. As already cited, initial validational efforts have linked communal orientation to helping behavior and to scales measuring similar constructs (social responsibility and emotional empathy).

4. Self-Disclosure Scale (SDS). An 11-item self-report scale which asks the test-taker to rate his/her degree of self-disclosure to a romantic partner or close friend on a number of private topics (sample item: "The things that I worry about most"). The test-taker rates his/her level of disclosure on each topic on a scale from 1 (have not talked about this item at all to my partner or friend) to 7 (have talked fully about this item to my partner or friend). This experimental scale, which assesses communion's intimacy facet, has yet to be examined for its psychometric properties. It is, however, quite face-valid and has been employed in past research by a Loyola University of Chicago researcher.
5. **Openness Scale.** A 48-item questionnaire which asks the test-taker to rate the applicability of each item to himself/herself (sample item: "I have an active fantasy life"). The rating scale spans from 1 (strongly disagree with statement) to 5 (strongly agree with statement). This measure, which was extracted from the NEO-PI (Costa & McCrae, 1985), yields an overall openness to experience score as well as scores on 6 facet subscales (openness to fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, and values).

The Openness scale is quite sound psychometrically. Internal consistency for the scale has been computed at .86 for males and .88 for females, using coefficient alpha. Coefficient alphas for the 6 openness subscales range from .60 to .79 (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Test-rest test reliability for the openness measure registers at .86 for a 6-month testing lag, and subscale test-retest reliabilities span from .66 to .79. As already noted, validational studies of this stable measure have linked it to a number of theoretically-similar personality scales.
CHAPTER VI
RESULTS

Composite Measurement of Agency and Communion

Construct Independence. As an initial step in data analysis, all facet measures of agency and communion were intercorrelated in a multi-trait (i.e. agency/communion) multi-method (i.e. operant/respondent measurement) matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). The results of these analyses, conducted on overall, female, and male samples, are summarized in Tables 4 through 6. Facet intercorrelations yielded moderate support for the independence of agency and communion: correlations between agency and communion facet measures in the overall sample were nonsignificant save for a moderate negative correlation between autonomy and communal orientation, $r (93) = -.24$, $p < .05$, and a marginally significant positive correlation between dominance and affiliation, $r (93) = .17$, $p < .10$. Analysis of female and male subsamples reveals these two unpredicted interrelations between agency and communion facets to hold in the small ($N = 21$) male sample only. Here autonomy and communal orientation correlate.
### Table 4

**Intercorrelation Matrix: Agency/Communion Facet Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet Scales</th>
<th>Agency Facet Scales</th>
<th>Communion Facet Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Aut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>49***</td>
<td>18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pow</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cos</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sds</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* a = p < .10  * p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.

Decimals omitted.
Table 5

**Intercorrelation Matrix: Agency/Communion Facet Measures Female Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Agency Facet Scales</th>
<th>Communion Facet Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Aut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>38**</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pow</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cos</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sds</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a = p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Decimals omitted.
### Table 6

**Intercorrelation Matrix: Agency/Communion Facet**

**Measures Male Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet Scales</th>
<th>Agency Facet Scales</th>
<th>Communion Facet Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Aut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>81***</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pow</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cos</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a = p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Decimals omitted.
substantially, $r (21) = -0.50$, $p < 0.05$, and dominance and affiliation correlate moderately, though nonsignificantly, $r (21) = 0.32$, $p = 0.15$. In the much larger female sample ($N=70$), no significant, or even marginally significant, correlations between agency and communion facets were obtained. Most importantly, the composite agency and communion measures to be discussed next were not significantly related to one another in overall, $r (91) = -0.06$, $p = 0.60$, female, $r (70) = 0.04$, $p = 0.76$, or male, $r (21) = -0.23$, $p = 0.31$, samples.

Convergences of Agency Facets. Evidence for the interrelation of various facets of agency is moderate. Dominance and achievement correlate substantially and positively in the overall sample, $r (93) = 0.49$, $p < 0.001$; this relationship also holds in both female and male subsamples. In addition, autonomy was marginally related to dominance, $r (93) = 0.18$, $p < 0.10$, although this moderate relationship did not reach significance in the smaller female and male subsamples. Autonomy failed to correlate significantly with achievement, and contrary to predictions, power motivation failed to correlate significantly with any of the other facet measures of agency.

Based on the observed pattern of
intercorrelations, achievement, autonomy's and dominance were deemed sufficiently interrelated to be combined into a composite measure of agency (agency composite=summed z-scores for the three measures). As power motivation failed to relate to any other agency facets, it was omitted from this composite. Mean composite agency scores (which will be referred to simply as "agency scores") for overall, female, and male samples were -.02, -.35, and 1.12, respectively. Respective standard deviations for the three samples were 2.15, 1.96, and 2.39. A t-test comparison between female and male means revealed a significant gender difference, $t(90) = -2.87$, $p < .01$, with males scoring higher. No significant gender difference in variances was obtained, $F_{max}(20,70) = 1.48$, ns.

Convergence of Communion Facets. Evidence for the interrelation of various communion facets is strong. In the overall sample, communal orientation correlated significantly with all of the other three communion facets employed: affiliation, $r(93) = .37$, $p < .001$, intimacy motivation, $r(93) = .25$, $p < .05$, and self disclosure, $r(93) = .36$, $p < .001$. Additionally, affiliation correlated moderately with self disclosure, $r(93) = .20$, $p < .05$. Intimacy motivation was the only
communion facet that did not fully behave as predicted in the overall sample, failing to correlate with affiliation or self disclosure. As the overall sample is 77% female, it is not surprising that the exact same pattern of intercorrelations between communion facets held in the female subsample. In the small male sample, communion facets failed to interrelate significantly, save for communal orientation and self disclosure's marginally significant correlation, \( r (21) = .37, p < .10 \).

Based on the pattern of correlations observed in the overall sample, where every communion facet correlated with at least one other, all four communion facets were converted into \( z \)-scores and summed into a composite communion measure (this will be referred to simply as the "Communion Measure"). The mean composite communion score for the overall sample was .02, with a standard deviation of 2.59. For the female subsample, the mean was .22, and the standard deviation was 2.64. The male subsample mean and standard deviation were -.62 and 2.40, respectively. Comparison of female and male means by \( t \)-test indicated no significant gender difference, \( t (91) = 1.33, p = .19 \). Furthermore, female and male variances did not differ significantly,
Agency/Communion and Millon's Basic Personality Styles

After composite measures of agency and communion were developed through the just-discussed examination of facet intercorrelations, these measures were next applied to Millon's eight basic personality styles. Each style was first correlated with agency and communion measures in overall, female, and male samples (see Tables 7-9). Additionally, each style served as the dependent variable in a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In all of these ANOVAs, the two independent factors were agency (high vs. low, median split) and communion (high vs. low, median split).

Schizoid Style. Results for the schizoid style were consistent with predictions. In the overall sample, this style correlated substantially and negatively with both agency, $r (90) = -.44, p < .001$, and communion, $r (90) = -.43, p < .001$; similar patterns were evident in both female and male subsamples. The two-way ANOVA produced no interaction but did reveal significant main effects for both agency, $F(1,86) = 8.76, p < .01$, and communion, $F(1,86) = 12.76; p < .01$. Subjects score higher on the Schizoid scale when they are low in agency and low in communion (LL).
Table 7

Correlations Between Composite Agency Measure/Agency Facets and Personality Style Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Style Variables</th>
<th>Agency Composite</th>
<th>Ach</th>
<th>Aut</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Pow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>-44***</td>
<td>-43***</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-43***</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>-56***</td>
<td>-50***</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>-43***</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>-61***</td>
<td>-33**</td>
<td>-50***</td>
<td>-47***</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>45***</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>35**</td>
<td>43***</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>71***</td>
<td>51***</td>
<td>38***</td>
<td>61***</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>64***</td>
<td>44***</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>60***</td>
<td>-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>-20a</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Agg</td>
<td>-18a</td>
<td>-33**</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>37***</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>35**</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>45***</td>
<td>45***</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>31**</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 7 (continued)

Note. N = 90. Agency Composite = the summed z-scores for Ach, Aut, and Dom. Pow was omitted from this composite due to its failure to correlate even marginally with any of the other three agency facet measures. Ach = PRF achievement. Aut = PRF autonomy. Dom = PRF dominance. Pow = TAT power.

a = p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Decimals omitted.
Table 8

Correlations Between Composite Communion Measure/Communion Facets and Personality Style Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Style Variables</th>
<th>Communion Composite</th>
<th>Aff</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>-43***</td>
<td>-59***</td>
<td>-27**</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>-17a</td>
<td>-49***</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>36***</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>63***</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>38***</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-29**</td>
<td>-18a</td>
<td>-21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Agg</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>42***</td>
<td>32**</td>
<td>32**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>36****</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>34**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>31**</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>41***</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>47***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>27**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 8 (continued)


\( a = p < .10 \). \( *p < .05 \). \( **p < .01 \). \( ***p < .001 \).

Decimals omitted.
Table 9
Correlations Between Agency/Communion Composite Measures and Personality Style Variables for Male and Female Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Style Variables</th>
<th>Female Subsample (N=68)</th>
<th>Male Subsample (N=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Composite</td>
<td>Communion Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>-42***</td>
<td>-50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>-52***</td>
<td>-26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>-56***</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>41***</td>
<td>37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>67***</td>
<td>27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>55***</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>43***</td>
<td>48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>31**</td>
<td>34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>46***</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

Note. Agency Composite = summed $z$-scores of PRF achievement, autonomy, and dominance scales. Communion Composite = summed $z$-scores for PRF affiliation, TAT intimacy, COS, and SDS.

$a = p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Decimals omitted.
Avoidant Style. Although no hypotheses were forwarded for the avoidant style, correlations and the ANOVA revealed substantial relationships between this style and agency/communion. The avoidant style was strongly and negatively correlated with agency in the overall sample, $r(90) = -0.56$, $p < 0.001$, as well as in the female and male subsamples. The avoidant style was also marginally related to communion in the overall sample, $r(90) = -0.17$, $p < 0.10$; this latter relationship held only in the female subsample, $r(68) = -0.26$, $p < 0.05$. A two-way Agency X Communion ANOVA similarly revealed main effects for agency, $F(1,84) = 14.72$, $p < 0.001$, and communion, $F(1,84) = 4.77$, $p < 0.05$, and no interaction. Subjects score higher on the Avoidant scale when they are low in both agency and communion. This last contention must be qualified by the pattern of correlations obtained between the Avoidant scale and communion facet measures. Specifically, this personality style correlated substantially only with affiliation, $r(90) = -0.49$, $p < 0.001$, a measure of the social embeddedness facet, and not with the other three communion facet measures. Hence, the avoidant style is related to low agency and low affiliation rather than to low agency and low (global) communion.
Dependent Style. Predicted relations between agency, communion, and the dependent style were obtained. First, the Dependent scale was substantially and negatively related to agency, $r(90) = -0.61$, $p < 0.001$, with this relationship holding in both male and female subsamples. Second, the dependent style correlated marginally and positively with communion in the overall, $r(90) = 0.25$, $p < 0.10$, and male, $r(21) = 0.45$, $p < 0.05$, samples, although it did not relate to communion in the female sample. In the male subsample, three of the four communion facets correlated positively, though not always significantly, with the Dependent scale: affiliation, communal orientation, and self disclosure. An Agency X Communion ANOVA employing the Dependent scale as the dependent variable revealed significant main effects for agency, $F(1,84) = 34.52$, $p < 0.001$, and for communion, $F(1,84) = 6.28$, $p < 0.05$. Dependent scale score increases as communion increases and agency decreases.

Histrionic Style. Contrary to hypotheses linking it to the LH configuration, the histrionic style correlated positively with both communion and agency. In the overall sample, the Histrionic scale correlated moderately with the Communion Measure, $r(90) = 0.30$, $p <$
this general relation held in both female and male subsamples as well, although it did not reach significance in the latter. In the male sample, the Histrionic scale's correlation with the Communion Measure is solely the product of a substantial correlation with affiliation, \( r(21) = .81, p < .001 \); in the female sample, however, three of the four facets (affiliation, communal orientation, and self disclosure) correlate positively with the histrionic style. The Histrionic scale also correlated positively with agency, \( r(90) = .45, p < .001 \), and this relationship held in both female and male subsamples. An Agency X Communion ANOVA revealed main effects for both communion, \( F(1,85) = 6.04, p < .05 \), and agency, \( F(1,85) = 13.21, p < .001 \). No interaction was present. At least for overall and female samples, then, the histrionic style relates to the HH configuration.

**Narcissistic Style.** Predictions linking the narcissistic style to the HL configuration were only partially confirmed. Agency and the Narcissistic scale correlated substantially, \( r(90) = .71, p < .001 \), with this positive relationship holding in both female and male subsamples. In the female subsample, however, communion correlated positively, rather than negatively,
with the Narcissistic scale, \( r(68) = .27, p < .05 \), and this relationship was reflected in significant correlations between the Narcissistic scale and two of the four communion facet measures (affiliation and COS). In the male subsample, the Communion Measure failed to correlate significantly with the Narcissistic scale. An Agency X Communion ANOVA revealed no interaction and a significant main effect for agency only, \( F(1, 84) = 40.75, p < .001 \).

**Aggressive Style.** Predictions for the aggressive style were confirmed in correlational analyses and ANOVA, where the aggressive style was linked to the HL configuration. In the overall sample, the Aggressive scale correlated substantially with agency, \( r(90) = .64, p < .001 \), and this relationship held in male and female subsamples. The scale correlated negatively with communion in the overall sample, \( r(90) = -.26, p < .05 \), although this correlation did not reach significance in the female subsample. Analysis of communion facet correlates of the aggressive style reveal the style to relate only to the three facets concerned with the intimacy facet (COS, intimacy motivation, and SDS). A two-way, Agency X Communion ANOVA was similarly supportive of predictions, revealing main effects for
both agency, $F(1, 86) = 44.81$, $p < .001$, and communion, $F(1, 86) = 9.42$, $p < .01$, and no interaction: scores on the Aggressive scale increase as agency increases and communion decreases.

**Compulsive Style.** Contrary to predictions, the compulsive style failed to relate to the HL configuration. In fact, it failed to relate at all to agency or communion. In overall, male, and female samples, agency and communion did not correlate significantly with the Compulsive scale. Only two facet measures correlated at all with the compulsive style: achievement showed a moderate, positive correlation, $r(90) = .24$, $p < .05$, and autonomy showed a marginally significant negative correlation, $r(90) = -.20$, $p < .10$. These two relationships did not reach significance in the male subsample. No significant interaction or main effects were revealed in a two-way, Agency X Communion ANOVA employing the Compulsive scale as the dependent measure.

**Passive-Aggressive Style.** Predictions linking this style to the LL configuration received only partial, limited support. As hypothesized, the Passive-Aggressive scale correlated negatively with agency. However, this correlation was only moderate and
marginally significant in the overall sample, \( r (90) = -.18, p < .10 \), and it failed to reach significance in either female or male subsamples. Analysis of the four agency facet measures reveals a single significant correlation between the Passive-Aggressive scale and achievement, \( r (90) = -.33, p < .01 \), and this relationship fails to reach significance in the male subsample. Contrary to predictions, the Passive-Aggressive scale failed to correlate significantly with communion or any of its facets, save affiliation, \( r (90) = -.23, p < .05 \), and this latter correlation did not reach significance in the male subsample. An Agency X Communion ANOVA produced no significant interaction or main effects.

**Agency/Communion and Openness to Experience**

Although no hypotheses regarding openness to experience's relationship to agency/communion were forwarded, correlational analyses and ANOVA reveal significant relationships between the constructs (see Tables 7 through 9). First, openness correlates significantly and positively with agency in the overall sample, \( r (90) = .37, p < .001 \), female subsample, \( r (68) = .43, p < .001 \), and male subsample, \( r (21) = .46, p < .05 \). Additionally, openness correlates substantially
and positively with communion in overall, $r (90) = .42, \ p < .001$, and female, $r (68) = .48, \ p < .001$, samples, although this relationship did not hold in the male sample. Similarly, a two-way Agency X Communion ANOVA employing openness as the dependent variable revealed significant main effects for both agency, $F(1,85) = 21.53, \ p < .001$, and communion, $F(1,85) = 11.90, \ p < .01$. Analysis of correlations between agency/communion facets and openness reveals a number of significant relationships. Three of agency’s four facets, achievement, autonomy, and dominance, all correlate positively with openness at at least a marginal level of significance. Similarly, three of communion’s four facet measures, affiliation, communal orientation, and self disclosure’s demonstrate modest positive correlations with openness. Notably, the only two agency/communion facets that failed to correlate significantly with openness were intimacy motivation and power motivation—the two operant facet measures employed.

Composite agency and communion measures correlated positively with a number of openness facets as well as with the overall openness measure. In the female subsample, agency correlated significantly with 5 of the
6 openness facets: aesthetics, $r (68) = .31$, $p < .01$, feelings, $r (68) = .33$, $p < .01$, actions, $r (68) = .29$, $p < .05$, ideas, $r (68) = .46$, $p < .001$, and values, $r (68) = .33$, $p < .01$. For the most part, this general pattern held in the male subsample as well, although most correlations did not reach significance, and openness to feelings was not related to agency. Additionally, openness to fantasy correlated substantially with agency in the male subsample, $r (21) = .52$, $p < .05$. Like agency, communion correlated with 5 of openness' 6 facets in the female subsample. In this case, the facets were fantasy, $r (68) = .41$, $p < .001$, aesthetics, $r (66) = .34$, $p < .01$, feelings, $r (68) = .39$, $p < .01$, actions, $r (68) = .29$, $p < .05$, and values, $r (68) = .37$, $p < .01$. Only the correlation between communion and openness to feelings attained significance in the male subsample, $r (21) = .44$, $p < .05$.

Agency's positive correlations with openness facets exclusively concerned with orientation to inner world (openness to feelings and openness to actions), or inner openness, contradict agency's hypothesized affiliation with denial. Specifically, if denial is a central facet of agency, as Bakan (1966) asserts, then
agency should be negatively correlated or unrelated to measures of inner openness. A follow-up analysis examined the hypothesis that communion might mediate the obtained relationship between agency and inner openness by either mitigating or failing to mitigate agency. Subjects with below-median communion scores were placed in an unmitigated agency subsample; for these subjects, agentic leanings are not balanced by communal ones, and agency should be negatively related or unrelated to inner openness. Subjects with above-median communion scores comprised the mitigated agency subsample. Here, communal influences may transpose the raw, affect- and impulse-denying drives of agency, leading to the detached receptivity that characterizes openness; in the mitigated agency subsample, agency and openness should correlate positively.

Agency-openness correlations within unmitigated and mitigated agency subsamples conformed to the patterns just-outlined (see Table 10). In the mitigated agency subsample, agency correlated positively with all three openness facets concerned with openness to inner world: feelings, $r (45) = .38, p < .05$, actions, $r (45) = .46, p < .01$, and fantasy, $r (45) = .26, p < .08$. In the unmitigated agency subsample, however, agency was
Table 10

Correlations Between Agency and Openness to Experience
For Mitigated and Unmitigated Agency Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness Variables</th>
<th>Mitigated Agency Subsample (N=48)</th>
<th>Unmitigated Agency Subsample (N=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Openness</td>
<td>48**</td>
<td>31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>46**</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  a = p < .10.  *p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
Decimals omitted.
unrelated to these same three inner openness facets. Contrary to the results obtained for the overall sample, results for the low communion sample indicate that unmitigated agency is unrelated to openness to one's inner world. Agency's affiliation with denial is not challenged by the present study's findings.

Expressor and Suppressor Subsamples

As is evident in Tables 7 and 8, operant agency/communion facet measures (TAT intimacy and TAT power) largely failed to correlate with respondent personality variables. This failure was next examined in light of McClelland's (1980) contention that operant and respondent measures of the same content area nevertheless assess distinct aspects of personality. Respondent measures assess the conscious self-picture that emerges when one self-reflects; operant measures assess less-conscious aspects of personality. As the MCMI and the Openness scale are respondent measures, it was conjectured that respondent-assessed, "reflective" agency/communion might mediate "less-conscious" agency/communion's effects on MCMI and openness scores. To examine this hypothesis, subjects were divided into expressor and suppressor subsamples. Expressors are individuals whose level of reflective agency (or
communion) exceeds their level of less-conscious agency (or communion). For them, less-conscious agency (or communion) should be relatively unconstrained or unlimited by conscious factors and hence should be relatively free to exert a determining influence on MCMI and openness scores. Suppressors, on the other hand, are individuals whose level of less-conscious agency (or communion) exceeds their level of reflective agency (or communion). Here, less-conscious agency's (or communion's) response-determining effects on respondent measures should be relatively constrained or attenuated by conscious factors.

Operational definitions of expressor and suppressor subsamples were based on comparisons between z-scores. The agency expressor subsample was defined as those subjects whose average on the three respondent agency facet measures (transformed to z-scores), achievement, autonomy, and dominance, exceeded their z-score for power motivation; agency suppressors were those subjects whose z-scored power motivation exceeded their z-scored respondent agency average. Similarly, the expressor and suppressor subsamples for communion were respectively defined as those subjects whose communion respondent averages (i.e., average of
affiliation, COS, SDS) exceeded, or failed to exceed, their TAT intimacy z-scores.

A number of significant correlations emerged between power/intimacy and MCMI scales/openness when the overall sample was divided into expressor and suppressor subsamples (see Table 11). In the agency expressor subsample, TAT power correlated in the predicted direction with schizoid, $r (45) = -.41, p < .01$, dependent, $r (45) = -.47, p < .01$, narcissistic, $r (45) = .39, p < .01$ and aggressive, $r (45) = .39, p < .01$, scales. Expressor power also correlated substantially with the Avoidant scale, $r (45) = -.41, p < .01$, and with openness to actions, $r (45) = .29, p < .05$. For agency suppressors, a generally weaker pattern of relationships emerged. Only one predicted correlation reached significance—that between power motivation and the Aggressive scale, $r (45) = .33, p < .05$. Although correlations between power motivation and both dependent and narcissistic scales were in predicted directions, significance was only marginal. Unpredicted was power motivation’s substantial correlations with openness to fantasy, $r (43) = .31, p < .05$, and openness to feelings, $r (49) = .41, p < .05$.

As did the agency expressor/suppressor subsamples,
Table 11

Correlations Between TAT Power/Intimacy and Personality Style Variables for Expressor and Supressor Subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Style Variables</th>
<th>Overall Sample (N=90)</th>
<th>Expressor Subsamples (N=45)</th>
<th>Expressor Subsamples (N=49)</th>
<th>Supressor Subsamples (N=43)</th>
<th>Supressor Subsamples (N=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pow</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Pow</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Pow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-41**</td>
<td>-37**</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-41**</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-47**</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-18a</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>33a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Agg</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 11 (continued)

Note. Pow = TAT power motivation. Int = TAT intimacy motivation. Certain relationships are somewhat predetermined by the scaling properties of respondent agency/communion measures and TAT power/intimacy: respondent agency/communion score limits intimacy/power score, and respondent agency/communion score is already known to correlate with various MCMI and openness scales.

a = p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Decimals omitted.
the communion expressor/suppressor subsamples revealed a number of relationships not evident in the overall sample. For communion expressors, intimacy motivation correlated as predicted with two MCMI scales: schizoid, $r (49) = -.37, p < .01$, and histrionic, $r (49) = .30, p < .05$. Additionally, intimacy correlated positively with overall openness, $r (49) = .30, p < .05$, openness to fantasy, $r (49) = .28, p < .05$, and openness to feelings, $r (49) = .34, p < .05$. For communion suppressors, only one predicted relationship, that between intimacy motivation and the Dependent scale, reached even marginal significance, $r (40) = .27, p < .10$. Additional, unpredicted relationships were obtained between TAT intimacy and overall openness, $r (40) = .40, p < .05$, openness to fantasy, $r (40) = .28, p < .10$, openness to feelings, $r (40) = .32, p < .05$, openness to actions, $r (40) = .32, p < .05$, and openness to values, $r (40) = .32, p < .05$. 
Agency and communion are broad orientations of the "I" to both inner and outer worlds. The present study sought to 1) measure these two constructs in a multifaceted manner, using only facet measures concerned with outer, interpersonal orientation, and then 2) relate composite agency/communion measures to broad personality variables that encompass both inner and outer orientations.

**Multimethod Measurement of Agency and Communion**

**Agency.** The first goal of this study, then, was to examine the viability of multifaceted measurement of agency and communion. In the case of agency, this examination yielded limited evidence for facet convergence. Respondent measures of agency's two interpersonal facets, separation and mastery, were only marginally related to one another: one would expect a stronger intercorrelation between facets of the same construct. Furthermore, although the two respondent measures assessing the mastery facet intercorrelated substantially in both female and male subsamples, these
measures were unrelated to power motivation, an operant measure of the mastery facet. Due to power motivation's failure to correlate significantly with any other agency facet measures, the composite Agency Measure developed in this study was restricted to the three respondent measures employed: PRF achievement, PRF autonomy, and PRF dominance.

The most parsimonious explanation for the generally weak pattern of interrelations obtained among agency facets is that agency itself is not a unity. Perhaps separation and mastery are independent factors that cannot be subsumed under one conceptual entity. Alternate explanations are however available as well. The failure of respondent-assessed separation (PRF autonomy) to correlate substantially with respondent-assessed mastery (PRF achievement and PRF dominance) may stem from the fact that all respondent separation and mastery measures came from the same measure: Jackson's PRF. As the PRF conceptualizes autonomy as a trait unrelated to dominance and achievement, it would follow that Autonomy scale items reflecting autonomy theoretically but correlating too highly with dominance/achievement items would have been eliminated in the scale construction phase. Indeed,
issues of trait independence and factorial purity were of prime concern in the PRF's development (Jackson, 1984). To circumvent this possible problem, future studies should draw facet measures from different inventories. The failure of various agency facet measures to intercorrelate can alternately be framed as a purely conceptual issue. From this vantage point, the failure of agency facets to interrelate empirically does not necessarily negate agency's utility as a conceptual unity or integration. If we adhere to a coherence theory of truth (Rychlak, 1981), agency becomes valid if it is useful (i.e., if it helps us organize and make sense of our observations), and its empirical hanging-together becomes of secondary importance.

Finally, the absence of a relation between respondent-assessed mastery and operant-assessed mastery (i.e., power motivation) can also be explained as a measurement issue. Operant and respondent measures of the same content area generally do not intercorrelate, and McClelland (1980) cites two related reasons why this should be. First, the two types of measures create different response sets in the test-taker, and hence, contribute different types of method variance to scores: respondent measures pull for consistent and
socially-desirable responding, while operant measures pull for variability and creativity in responding. Second, operant and respondent measures assess different levels or aspects of personality. Operant measures assess the less-conscious aspects of personality that drive us when we are in a non-reflective mode, while respondent measures tap more-conscious aspects of personality—the conscious self-picture invoked by self-reflection. In other words, operant measures assess how we act, while respondent measures assess how we think. Theoreticians as far back as Freud (1910) and Jung (1971) have noted that there is no reason why these two realms should be in accord, and in fact, much of their theorizing is built on the idea of clashing conscious and unconscious orientations in dynamic interaction.

Communion. While the evidence for various agency facets' convergence upon a single superordinate construct is limited, the evidence for facet convergence is strong in the case of communion. In short, social embeddedness and intimacy facets are related to one another and may be conceived as being part of a single formal-final cause pattern. Respondent measures concerned with distinct constructs (affiliation,
communal orientation, and self disclosure) can meaningfully be combined to yield a composite measure of communion. This is not to say that each of the respondent facet measures employed measures the same thing. Instead, each assesses distinct aspects of a single, broad construct. While all respondent communion measures related to one another, they, save communal orientation, failed to relate to operant communion, as assessed via the TAT. As in the case of agency, then, respondent and operant measures of communion apparently tap different levels of personality and/or create different response sets in the test-taker.

**Construct Independence.** Agency and communion appear to be independent dimensions, although this contention must be qualified in the case of males, where low N/low power precludes strong conclusions. The fact that agency and communion appear to be independent has definite implications for personality theory. Specifically, a Jungian view is suggested, where agency, or animus, and communion, or anima, coexist within the individual as independent potentials (Jung, 1971). In other words, agency and communion are not innately exclusive of one another--individuals can be high in agency and communion without posing an inherent
contradiction. Hence, conceptualizations of agency and communion as opposing poles of a single continuum, which result in misleading unidimensional measures of independent constructs, represent the incorrect bringing-to-bear of a construct, opposition, on two distinct phenomena, agency and communion.

Agency/Communion Configuration and Millon's Basic Personality Styles

Schizoid Style. The interaction of low agency and low communion, or the LL configurations, characterizes Millon's (1983) schizoid style. Schizoid individuals are oriented toward neither separation and mastery nor receptivity and embeddedness. Furthermore, analysis of subjects for whom conscious schema configuration favors expression of less-conscious orientation on respondent scale responses (i.e., expressors) suggests that the schizoid's agency and communion deficits may be pervasive: the LL configuration characterizes the schizoid's less-conscious self, as well as the schizoid's conscious reflections about self. Hence, as Millon (1983) asserts, the schizoid's conscious orientation toward low agency/low communion seems an accurate reflection of his/her true nature rather than a defensive shunning of mastery or receptivity. In
conclusion, the schizoid pattern seems best-understood as a failure to orient to inner and outer worlds rather than as a type of orientation to these two realms.

Avoidant Style. The avoidant individual’s orientation is characterized by low agency. This is surprising, as the avoidant personality is portrayed by Millon (1974) to resort to agentic separation in the service of avoiding anticipated derogation. Rather than being defensively oriented toward self-sufficiency, the avoidant appears to be lacking in self-sufficiency. Perhaps, then, the avoidant’s problem could be profitably understood as one of under-immunity to the criticisms of others: the avoidant personality lacks the ability to separate himself/herself sufficiently from the opinions of others. In light of this, psychotherapy with the avoidant personality might focus more on teaching the client to differentiate personal opinions of self from the opinions of others. Bolstering the avoidant’s feelings of self-worth, as Millon (1974) recommends, will be more effective if accompanied by work at establishing the client’s view of self as a separate and independent person who is relatively distinct from the criticisms of others.

Regarding communion, the avoidant personality
seems, as Millon asserts, to have average leanings toward intimacy combined with a strong aversion to social contact. In the present study, this manifested itself in a lack of relation between the avoidant style and all communion facets save social embeddedness, which was negatively related to the avoidant style.

**Dependent Style.** The interplay of low agency and high communion, or the LH configuration, characterizes the dependent style, although only the agency-dependence aspect of this relationship attained significance for females. Consistent with Millon’s thought, the dependent person appears to be one who actively orients away from separation and mastery and toward intimacy. Furthermore, results for motive expressors suggest that at least the low agency component of the dependent make-up pervades less-conscious levels of personality as well as the conscious self-picture. The presence of communal leanings in the absence of mitigating agency transposes the meaning of communion for the dependent person. In this case, communion becomes a one-sided leaning upon others, rather than an interdependent exchange. Consequently, communion for dependent individuals is not expressed in generalized sociability, as fleeting interpersonal contacts cannot provide the
direction and nurturance that they crave.

**Histrionic Style.** Contrary to hypotheses, the HH configuration, rather than the LH configuration, captures the histrionic style. A number of interpretations of this relationship are possible. First, it may well be that Millon's (1981) account of the histrionic is in need of revision: perhaps Millon's framing of the histrionic as a needy, other-reliant individual ought to be bolstered more heavily with a portrayal of the histrionic as an active, dominating, and independent person who manipulates the social world to meet his/her personal ends (i.e., attention and approval). Histrionics are other-mastering as much as they are other-reliant.

The histrionic's unpredicted affinity for agency can alternately be explained as a defense against characterological dependence. In other words, the histrionic may be quite similar in kind to the dependent, differing only in his/her "protests too much" negating of this dependence in the conscious self-schema. Such an interpretation is somewhat supported by the expressor subsample, where communal influences, but not agenctic ones, characterized the histrionic style at deeper, less-conscious levels: for
the histrionic, then, agency may typify only the persona, or who the individual thinks he/she is, and not the deeper self—the one in charge when the individual behaves without reflecting upon his/her behavior. Viewed extraspectively, then, the histrionic fits the LH pattern, clamoring for mirroring and external provisions of self esteem. Viewed introspectively, through the eyes of the "I," however, the histrionic embraces the HH pattern, experiencing self as an independent, sociable, and powerful agent who has the tools to win the attention of others.

**Narcissistic Style.** The results of the present study clearly link agency to the narcissistic style. Narcissists are strongly invested in separation and mastery. Furthermore, analysis of the expressor subsample suggests that this investment may characterize their less-conscious orientation as well as their more-conscious, self-reflective orientation. Contrary to predictions, the narcissistic style does not appear related to low communion. Hence, the narcissistic style embodies a pattern of exaggerated agency juxtaposed with average communion, rather than a pattern of unmitigated agency. However, this is only a matter of degree: the narcissist still may be said to embody unmitigated
agency. However, this is only a matter of degree: the narcissist still may be said to embody unmitigated agency in the sense that leanings toward separation and mastery exceed or override those toward intimacy or social embeddedness. In the case of females, the conclusion just advanced must be qualified somewhat, as two out of the four communion facet measures (PRF affiliation and COS) correlated positively with the narcissistic style. As both of these measures are 1) respondent in nature, tapping the conscious self-picture, and 2) in accord with culturally-sanctioned female stereotypes (i.e. "females should be sociable and giving"), it is unclear whether female narcissists are just being "narcissistic," believing that all favorable female qualities apply to them, or if the narcissistic style for females really is of a different nature than that discussed by Millon.

Aggressive Style. Bakan's (1966) pattern of unmitigated agency, or what we have called the HL configuration, bears a strong relationship to Millon's aggressive personality style. In short, the aggressive personality adopts an orientation toward separation and mastery that is relatively unchecked by leanings toward sharing of self and reception of other.
The relations between agency/communion and histrionic, narcissistic, and aggressive styles obtained in this study integrate and differentiate these three personality styles. First, all three styles resonate in their expression of agency. They can, however, be distinguished in terms of the degree to which agentic features are balanced or transposed by communion. The histrionic is invested in and dependent upon others, and hence, agency serves the ends of building alliances and winning attention—of maintaining contact. The aggressive personality, at the other extreme, is specifically oriented away from social embeddedness and intimacy; in this case agency serves the end of maintaining one's impregnability and separateness, or of keeping others at bay. The narcissistic personality lies somewhere inbetween these two extremes, being oblivious to others rather than invested in or repelled from them.

**Compulsive Style.** The constructs of agency and communion do not relate to the compulsive personality style. Rather than being globally oriented toward agency, as was hypothesized, compulsives instead are oriented toward only one circumscribed aspect of agency, self-mastery. In fact, compulsives are oriented away
from separation, another aspect of agency. In the case of the compulsive, then, agency does not behave as a unitary construct. In fact, the opposition of two agency facets that usually covary, separation and (self) mastery, forms a central dynamic in this style: as Millon notes, the compulsive is obsessed with self-mastery because of an over-sensitivity to the opinions of others, or a lack of independence/separation. The compulsive controls self to prevent derogation by others. While compulsives are oriented away from separation, this does not mean that they are particularly oriented toward social embeddedness. In fact, the compulsive style is unrelated to communion or any of its facets.

The findings of this study suggest that compulsive and avoidant personality styles may be viewed as alternate solutions to the same problem. Both compulsive and avoidant individuals lack agentic separation, being too vulnerable to others' opinions. The avoidant chooses a solution of isolation, withdrawing from others despite average communal leanings. The compulsive, on the other hand, adopts an agentic solution, bolstering self-control to prevent the incidence of behaviors worthy of slight.
Passive-Aggressive Style. Contrary to hypotheses, global agency and communion are largely unrelated to the passive-aggressive style. One possible explanation for this is that passive-aggressive subjects' hallmark ambivalence led to inconsistent responding on agency/communion scales, such that contradictory responses averaged to create an impression of neutrality. The two agency/communion facets that related negatively to the passive-aggressive style, (self) mastery and social embeddedness, support Millon's (1981) contention that 1) the style is characterized by a failure to invest in self-mastery, and 2) the passive-aggressive simultaneously rejects reliance on the general social group.

Agency/Communion and Openness to Experience

The unpredicted relationships obtained between agency/communion and openness to experience in this study both support the formulation of agency/communion advanced and clarify the nature of openness. First of all, the central hypothesis that communion is an orientation spanning outer and inner worlds was confirmed: individuals oriented toward intimate and sociable exchange with others are also receptive toward their inner worlds of affect and impulse. Hence,
communion's three defining facets of inner receptivity, intimacy, and social embeddedness do indeed covary as if they reflected one superordinate construct. Additionally, communion represents not just an outer orientation to people, but one to the general external stimulus world as well. Communal people are receptive to the raw information of the senses (i.e., openness to aesthetics) as well as toward other people.

Agency is also positively related to openness, although with one important qualification. Specifically, agency is only associated with a general receptivity to experience when mitigated by communion; in this case, this receptivity applies to the inner world of feeling, fantasy, and impulse, as well as to the external world. At first glance, then, such a linking of agency to openness appears to argue against inclusion of denial as a defining facet of agency. Analysis of agency-openness relationships for subjects embracing unmitigated agency, however, allays this argument. When unmitigated by communal influences, agency is unrelated to receptivity toward one's inner world, correlating only with openness' intellectual aspects: openness to ideas, or "intellectual curiosity," and perhaps openness to values, or "independence of judgement" (Costa & McCrae,
1985, p. 10). As "there is no evidence that closedness (i.e., low openness) is a defensive reaction" (Costa & McCrae, 1985, p. 10), unmitigated agency's failure to correlate negatively with openness facets connoting inner receptivity should not be viewed as evidence against agency's association with denial.

The present study's application of agency/communion to openness also clarifies the nature of openness. Openness in short is a phenomenon of the HH configuration, reflecting an interaction of agentic and communal forces. Every time one opens oneself to raw experience, one approaches the realm of the unmanifest (Bakan, 1966). In other words, the open individual moves into a realm not under the ego's control, one that can challenge the regime of sameness or consistency that the ego dogmatically imposes (Guidano & Liotti, 1983). This study's findings suggest that such movements call for a blending of mastery/detachment and receptivity/surrender. Bakan (1966) corroborates that openness, or the movement into the regions of the unmanifest, has to be from the region of the manifest. Leaving this base completely...provides no lever for making the unmanifest manifest. Similarly, clinging to the base...makes it impossible to understand afresh what has not been understood already. (pp. 12-13)

In other words, agency provides the firm base of
"I-ness" and objectivity from which assays into raw experience can be made; communion provides the receptive drive that compels one to approach the "not-I," rather than mastering/denying it.

**Operant and Respondent Measures of Agency/Communion**

Operant and respondent measures of agency/communion failed to interrelate in this study save for a moderate relationship between intimacy motivation and communal orientation. One explanation for this general failure is that operant and respondent measures contribute different types of method variance to scores, such that actual relations between construct facets, say power motivation and dominance, are obscured (McClelland, 1980). An alternate possibility is that operant and respondent measures tap different levels of personality: operant measures may tap the orientations that characterize less-conscious functioning, while respondent measures may access the more-conscious self-schemas that characterize self-reflective thought and behavior. The present study found some support for this latter contention in its examination of expressor subsamples. Specifically, for subjects whose conscious self-pictures favor the expression of less-conscious agentic/communal orientations under conditions of
self-reflection, substantial relationships between operant agency/communion and respondent openness/MCMI styles were obtained. Of particular note here were the theoretically-consistent relationships obtained between operant agency (i.e., TAT power) and schizoid, avoidant, dependent, narcissistic, and aggressive personality styles. Furthermore, operant communion (i.e., TAT intimacy) evidenced a moderate, though not always consistent, positive relationship with respondent openness.

One explanation for the results obtained for expressors is that a dynamic interplay between conscious and unconscious forces has been tapped, where conscious schemas mediate expression of less-conscious orientation under self-reflective conditions. However, this explanation must be qualified. Specifically, analyses of expressor and suppressor samples were not statistically clean, as TAT power and intimacy's ranges of variability were restricted by their relations to measures correlated with MCMI scales/openness. In other words, respondent agency/communion scores constrained operant power/intimacy scores: correlations obtained between power/intimacy and MCMI/openness may to some degree be reflections of correlations between
respondent agency/communion and MCMI/openness, rather than pure operant-respondent relationships. In fact, some support for this latter contention is provided by the suppressor subsample data, where a number of albeit weaker operant-respondent correlations were obtained. In conclusion, it is unclear whether operant-respondent correlations obtained in the present study represent statistical artifacts, the interaction of levels of personality, or a combination of the two.

Limitations

In addition to the just-cited limitations on expresser/suppressor results, a number of other factors restrict the generality of this study's findings. First of all, the applicability of the obtained results to males is limited. Due to a low number of male subjects and consequent low power, some relationships between agency/communion and aspects of personality may have gone undetected in the male sample. Furthermore, analysis of similarities and differences between males and females with respect to agency/communion was largely precluded. Even in light of such constraints, however, it does appear that males are more agentic than females, although the issue of gender differences in communion must remain an open question.
A second major limitation of this study is that the majority of conclusions made rest on respondent, self-report data. It may be most accurate in this case to interpret correspondences between agency/communion and personality style variables as correspondences in the conscious self-picture, or persona. While we can probably rest assured that the composite agency and communion measures predict agentic and communal themes in self-reflective behavior, it is unclear whether they also predict such themes in the individual's less-conscious functioning.

Recommendations for Future Research

Two obvious recommendations for future research stem from the limitations just-discussed. First, this study's findings are in need of replication on a sample with equal numbers of males and females. Second, future studies on agency and communion should examine the constructs' relations to behavior in low-self-monitoring conditions, as well as to self-reports. More generally, the relation between less-conscious and more-conscious agentic/communal orientations needs further examination. In addition to noting the interplay between independent agentic and communal orientations, future personality researchers might incorporate the interaction between
conscious and unconscious agentic/communal orientations into their formulations and measures. In particular, psychological health might be conceptualized and researched as a balancing between 1) agentic and communal orientations, and 2) conscious and less-conscious agentic (or communal) orientations.

The agency/communion measures developed in this study could profitably be applied to the study of Jungian adult-developmental hypotheses (Jacobi, 1962; Jung, 1971). Specifically, males should become more communal with age, moving from the stereotypically-masculine HL configuration toward the HH configuration. Females, on the other hand, should move from the stereotypically-female LH configuration toward the HH configuration. Interestingly, Jung (1971) asserts the aim of the second half of life to be individuation, or the progressive integration of the "not-I" with the "I:" openness to experience, a concomittant of the HH configuration, may be a crucial prerequisite to such a process, representing the ego-orientation necessary for the hero’s journey inward.

Another area in which composite agency and communion measures might be applied is in therapy outcome research. Specifically, it may be that
different therapeutic approaches are implicated for different agency/communion configurations. Individuals typified by the LH configuration, for example, could conceivably benefit from cognitive approaches, such as Beck's (1976) Cognitive Therapy, where the ego's mastery of inner and outer worlds, and its progressive elaboration of an independent identity, are fostered. For the HL configuration, on the other hand, cognitive approaches would seem contraindicated, as they would only fortify an already exaggerated pattern of imperviousness to promptings from within and without.
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