

PART ONE - THEORETICAL

This first part of the thesis which is theoretical consists of three chapters, chapters II, III and IV. This part is devoted to a discussion of the concepts of Personality, Culture and the relationship between personality and culture.

The first chapter is ' A critical estimate of the theories of Personality '. Several thinkers, in the fields of Psychology, Sociology, and - Anthropology have contributed a good deal to bring out various aspects of personality. There are also a few clinicians, physiologists, biologists and geographers who have expressed their views on Personality. It is not possible to review all the view-points in a chapter. Here an attempt is made to point out that the individual cannot be understood without a reference to his participation in a - particular culture. The individual, society and culture are interrelated. Hence, in the study of

personality the psychologist and the anthropologist should cooperate. The approach adopted in this thesis may be called the " Psycho-cultural or Socio-Psychological approach to personality."

The second chapter discusses the nature of Culture. To a social scientist there is no distinction between a cultured and an uncultured society. Every society has its culture in the sense that it has its own ways of behaviour shared by all the members of that particular group and transmitted from generation to generation. Culture is a configuration of patterns. Societies and ~~social~~^{social} groups differ in their cultures. Hence, people are different according to the diversity of cultures. The understanding of the nature of culture is necessary in the study of personality.

The next chapter is ' Personality and the relation between personality and culture.' After defining 'Personality ' it is shown that there are four factors viz, biological, social,cultural and physical, which are the determinants of personality. Other factors operate and are meaningful only in relation to culture. The structure of individual's

personality, his modes of thinking, feeling and behaving, and even abnormalities, are culturally conditioned.

CHAPTER II

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE OF THE THEORIES OF PERSONALITY

I. INTRODUCTION PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to examine critically various theories of personality, secondly, through a process of critical analysis to arrive at an approach which may be useful in evaluating the field work data and finally, to build up an approach to personality which may throw light in understanding human behaviour. Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology are three important social and objective sciences which study the individual, society and culture respectively. But the individual is an 'individual' in the sense that his personality is different from others. One reason for this is his membership of a particular

social group and participation in culture. Thus the study of individual and his personality is incomplete without references to the society and culture in which he is born and participates. Hence, in the study of personality a purely psychological or a purely sociological or anthropological treatment will be partial and incomplete. An attempt is made to show that in the study of personality all these three disciplines should be correlated and a common approach should be found out. This may be called the 'psycho-cultural approach to personality'.

II. THE PROBLEM

The problem of Personality occupies a central place in the study of human beings.

The interest in the mysteries, intricacies and complexities of one's own and other's behaviour is as old as human life on this earth. Man is curious to know why he behaves in a particular manner. Sometimes why does he seem to be what he is not? Why does he lose control over himself and behave in a manner apparently contrary to his nature? Every-

body is inquisitive to know what he is and to understand others. This curiosity seems to be equally urgent today as it was to the man in the dawn of civilisation.

Man was never content with the asking of questions, but also tried to understand and explain these questions. Since the dawn of civilisation to the present day, at each and every stage of development of human knowledge, man has tried to answer these questions. Few words have been used so often and yet have remained so vague and ill defined as the term 'personality'. There are a few fields of human endeavour in which so much effort has achieved so little. Brand (1) writes, "At present there is no proper explanation and no proper method in the study of personality".

G. W. Allport discusses fifty definitions of personality from the writings of philosophers and thinkers. These definitions are either in the form of idealisation or summarisation of knowledge of human nature. Personality has been equated with

1. Brand, H. (Ed.) : The Study of Personality.
New York, John Wiley, 1954. p.2.

character by some, With temperament by others.
To a student of psychology of personality it does not help much to know that Locke defined a person as 'a thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection and can consider self as itself", or that Stern defined it as "a multiform dynamic unity". It is not at all useful to know that to a metaphysician like Kant personality ".....is that quality in every man which makes him worthwhile". Rightly C. G. Jung(2) has observed, "The very concept of personality is so vague and badly defined that hardly two minds will take the word in the same sense".

The questions asked at the dawn of civilization are asked even today; what is Personality ? What are its traits ? How is it formed ?

Psychology as a natural science studies the Individual, his responses to the physical world. There are also other sciences which study the Individual as a physical and social being. The

2. Jung, C. G. : The Integration of Personality. London, Kegan Paul, 1940. p.299.

physical and biological sciences like Biology, Physiology, Zoology, Genetics study the individual as a physical and biological object. On the other hand there are social sciences like Economics, Sociology, Anthropology, Politics, etc. which study the different aspects of the individual's behaviour as a social being. Between these two groups of sciences, Psychology is a science which studies the Individual as an Individual. But, separating the mental processes of the individual from their social aspect is an artificial study. Similarly, individual's social behaviour cannot be understood without a reference to the underlying mental processes. So a properly developed science of Psychology is indispensable to the development of social sciences.

Both the disciplines of physical sciences and social sciences are brought together within psychology. But within the discipline of psychology a concept is needed to bring these two sides together - "This central role", according to Eysenck(3), "falls to the concept of personality, which thus acquires

3. Eysenck, H. J. : Sense and Nonsense in Psychology. p.178. Pelican Book. 1957.

its unique importance in psychology by bringing together two sets of workers otherwise isolated from each other. It does this, not by emphasizing the special field of study but rather by imparting a certain point of view to groups of studies which otherwise might have remained quite unrelated".

At this stage without making an attempt to define personality it is only suggested that no theory of personality can afford to ignore the biological and social aspects. Personality is not a pre-fabricated house, something ready at the birth. An individual is formed and grows into a being as a result of his or her participation in society.

III. A REVIEW OF SOME APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF PERSONALITY

We shall review the different theories, concepts and approaches to the study of personality and later on state our own approach to the study.

A(1) Two Conceptions of Personality :

Conceptions about personality can be broadly classified into two varieties, viz. individual

behaviour and general behaviour. The definitions of individual behaviour imply a study of individual differences, the consistency and patterning of individual behaviour. The definitions of general behaviour ~~minimize~~ imply a study of the common features in behaviour and minimize the individual differences. These two conceptions refer to behaviour, but differ about the kind of behaviours, the methods of observing behaviour, and the theory used to explain the observation. The distinction between individual behaviour and general behaviour is fundamental.

A(2) Individual Behaviour Definitions :

Cattell(4) defines personality as the sum total of the psychological characteristics of the individual. He(5) elaborated his previous definition and said that personality can be defined factorially, biologically and sociologically. "Personality, ~~he~~ says, McGill(6) 'is the organisation of needs, abilities and potentialities of the individual". Characteristic of the individualistic

-
4. Cattell, R. B. : An Introduction to Personality Study. London, Hutchinson, 1950. p.19.
 5. Ibid., p.221.
 6. McGill, V. J. : A Psychological Approach to Personality in Sellars, R.W., McGill, V.J., and Farber, M. (Ed.) Philosophy for the Future. New York, Macmillan, 1949. p.228.

approach is Allport's definition. According to him personality is 'the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment'(7).

The individual behaviour definitions emphasize that an individual's personality is unique. It is characteristic or distinctive with all response systems of individual persons. Secondly, the investigation of individual behaviour must be conducted without fractioning the observed behaviour, analysing it. That is the individual must be studied as a whole. Thirdly, the determiners of personality are inside the organism e.g. response tendencies like eating food, drinking water, etc., need to maintain internal chemical states, other needs, abilities, etc.

Individual behaviour definitions disagree about three aspects(8). These points of disagreement are - one, whether the study of personality includes all or a few particular influences upon the individual behaviour, second, whether personality

-
7. Allport, G. W. : Personality - A Psychological Interpretation. New York, Henry Holt, 1937.p.48.
 8. Brand, H.(Ed.) : Op.cit., p.7.

is that which is apprehended by the observer, and third, whether personality involves the adjustment of the individual. According to these definitions the determiners of personality are the descriptions of the organism which lead to differences in behaviour. Moreover, the determiners do not indicate any functional relationship between the conditions of the organism and the conditions of the environment, which give rise to the varieties of the individual behaviour. Factor analysis and personality trait theories are based on this individualistic attitude.

A(3) General Behaviour Definitions :

The general behaviour definitions imply a study of the common features in the behaviour and thus minimize the individual differences. The general behaviour definitions are not logical for they define the personality out of existence, i.e. distinct from the kinds of behaviour investigated. The characteristic representatives of these definitions are those of Miller and Dollard and Mowrer. They simply say that personality is the learned behaviour of human beings. These definitions emphasize the investigations of the universal laws of behaviour in which the individual differences are described as chance.

A(4) Criticism :

Personality of an individual though characteristic is neither completely individualistic i.e. different from that of other persons nor a common thing, i.e. shared by all. An individual along with his fellowmen is born and brought up in a common atmosphere. He possesses a body and shares the same environment as his fellowmen enjoy. So he cultivates some common habits of thinking and doing with his fellow beings. But 'A' as an individual is different from 'B'. 'A' is only 'A'. His behaviour cannot be entirely identical to that of 'B'. There is a difference between them in the reception of the stimuli and also in the organisation of these stimuli in his person. To this point then 'A's behaviour is characteristic and different from that of 'B'.

B(1) Personality in
Trait Psychology :

Some thinkers study man by analysing him into qualities,- traits. "A trait is a quality of a person particularly that which is used to describe his life processes, how he thinks, feels or acts"((9).

9. Notcutt, B. : The Psychology of Personality.
London, Methuen, 1952, p.26.

"Personality far from being a quantitative summation comparable to the I.Q. is essentially a balance among a veritable galaxy of conflicting behaviour tendencies".

'Traits', according to Murphy, "comprise the descriptive content of personality. It is important to keep in mind that traits are not concrete and distinct entities, but are functional formations inferred from the behaviour. Traits do not exist inside the ^{person's} parent's skin, traits are functional descriptions of relation between individuals and situations, and as such they overlap with other functional descriptions" (10).

Allport, Odbert, Cattell (11,12) etc. discuss the concept of basic traits. Allport and Odbert classify traits into four groups. (1) real traits, stable modes of individual's adjustment. (2) terms descriptive of present activity (temporary states of mind and mood). (3) judgement values and (4) miscellaneous. But there is always some duplication and overlap in trait names. It is obtained

-
10. Murphy, G. : Personality - A Biosocial approach to Origins and Structures. N.Y. Harper.1947. p.664.
 11. Cattell, R.B. : Description and Measurement of Personality. N.Y., World Book,1946.
 12. Allport, G.W. and Odbert, H.S. : Trait Names - A Psychological Study. Psy. Mono.No.211.1936.

from the fact that Cattell was able to reduce a list of 4500 personality trait names to about 160. In an extensive investigation of personality organisation Cattell has obtained evidence of existence of twelve primary personality factors.

B(2) Criticism :

Trait names are vague and very loosely used. They are often variously understood by different people. It is a general tendency that a trait name once introduced with one meaning in a particular situation is used in many other situations. Hence, a great variety of meanings is attached to a simple term and one is not sure what meaning he understands while using a trait name. Traits often get mixed up frequently influencing each other. For example, trait name 'introversion - extraversion' instead of representing a single dimension of a trait of personality actually includes many independent traits. Besides, traits are essentially individual and not common in character. "Strictly speaking", writes Allport(13), "no two persons have precisely the same traits. Though each of two men

13. Allport, G. W. : Personality - A Psychological Interpretation. New York, Henry Holt, 1937. p.297.

may be aggressive the style and range of aggression in each case is noticeably different".

Thirdly, a trait name generally contains a reference to a social norm, a comparison with the group to which the individual belongs. But in practical use we do not define the social group which acts as a standard of comparison, nor do we define the degree of deviation from the average to call it a trait. Fourthly, there is a common error arising in the use of the rating scales in measuring the traits, namely the 'halo effect'.

C(1) Factor Analysis :

Factor analysis and trait psychology are not very different. Sometimes the words 'factor' and 'trait' are used as synonyms. However, they are different in their preconception and method. Factor analysis is a technique that developed out of an attempt to interpret the intercorrelations of intelligence tests as expressions of certain factors of human mind. "An ability or factor should be thought of as a class or group of performances and it should be admitted only if the number of measurements in this class overlap or correlate

positively with one another"(14). An ability is inferred from the performance of ^{the} individual that some people carry out certain tasks more rapidly or more correctly than others. It was Sir Charles Spearman who first showed in 1904 and later in 1927 and developed that the human abilities were composed of one general factor and a large number of other special factors. Spearman regarded the general factor of intelligence as the basic feature of the factorial theory. Thurstone denied its existence, while Thompson said that there is hierarchy among the special factors. The acute controversy among the workers is on two questions; one, metaphysical status of the factors and second, the reality of general ability factor. "The disagreement on two large questions, has obscured the large measure of agreement reached on other questions. The controversy about the existence of the general ability factor is now generally recognised to be the result of differing techniques of analysis, and not so much a disagreement about matters of fact"(15).

14. Vernon, P.E. : The Structure of Human Abilities. London, Methuen, 1950. p.1.

15. Notcutt, B. : The Psychology of Personality. London, Methuen, 1953. p.77.

Eysenck(16) and R. Cattell are other supporters of the theory. Eysenck calls the factors the 'dimensions of personality'. Dimension is a better term, for it accepts continuous variation between extremes. But there is one assumption that everybody has a definable position on each dimension. So people differ from one another only in qualitative way. It is a mistaken view. For people not only differ in the degree of the traits but in the organisation of the traits also.

C(2) Criticism :

Bentley(17) and others have criticised the lossiness of factorists' terminology and the subjectiveness of their guesses about the nature of some of their factors. Some psychologists think that factor analysis is not important in the study of personality. Those who daily work with the people and are accustomed to deal with human beings make little use of its results, because they cannot picture a man as a collection of traits. It is not of much practical value in vocational and educational selection. For, more than the personality traits

-
16. Eysenck, H.J.: Dimensions of Personality. London. Kegan Paul, 1947.
 17. Bentley : Factors and Functions in Human Resources. Quoted by Vernon, P.E.: p.4.

and interests the relevant experiences, home circumstances and like should be taken into consideration. Secondly, factor analysis is not studying personality but studying individual differences in respect to various abilities. Such a study is compartmental and does not give an idea of the individual as a whole. Thirdly, the tests and techniques for measuring personality cannot be common for the whole mankind. As the societies differ in their structure and culture, so the arrangements of tests and techniques must differ. Fourthly, by knowing the various factors one cannot assess the individual. The interrelation of these factors and the pattern of their set up must be diagnosed. Theories of personality based upon factor analysis are the result of the psychologist's emphasis upon quantitative methods. One of the most frequent and vigorous criticism alleges that factor theorists create systems of artifacts which have no true relation to any single individual. They consider the individual apart from his social existence and consequently distort and misrepresent reality.

D(1

D(1) Personality as Types:

Study of personality as an assemblage of traits or classifying people into types has become very popular with philosophers, clinicians and psychologists. Type theories have been influenced by German thought but they also have been used by French, Dutch and Swiss thinkers. There is a difference between typological and trait description of personality. Traits refer to the attributes or the cluster of attributes which is the content of personality. Typology on the other hand is concerned with the personality as a whole. Traits deal with the nature of the components of personality, ^{types} are preoccupied with the nature of personality itself. We can say, 'to have a trait' but 'to belong' to a type. Traits describe personality, types classify it.

There is no fixed and generally accepted meaning of the word 'type'. Many distinct meanings of this word occur in current psychological literature. In the first sense types are considered as invariant innate or constitutional traits. Once rooted in life they are not subject to radical change.

They are intrinsically the man himself and not dependent on external events. Jung's and Kretschmer's classifications are of this type. Secondly, types are considered as systematic classification. As in Botany and Zoology plants are classified, in the same way persons can be said to belong to this or that type. In one way this kind of typology is a search for order and stability in the description of personality. Third meaning of type is an 'ideal'. The normal or ideal type is useful as a standard of comparison, for, the normal or ideal type is rare in its pure form. The economic man of nineteenth century theory was an ideal type. Spranger's ideal types are also an illustration of this. Type in another sense is conceived as a discontinuity in nature. It means some natural cleavage or boundary which provides a principle of classification. Among animals different species are marked out by such discontinuity. Among human beings also we might be able to find contrasting types reacting in opposite ways to the same situation. In the fifth sense, types are defined as groups of traits, 'constellations or syndromes of traits'.

Typologies in current use have been based on number of criteria, on external appearances and racial origin, on bodily form and physiological processes, on susceptibility to various functional psychoses, on perceptual tendencies and so on. Though there is a great variety in terminology and techniques of measurements, most of the views and descriptions seem to agree well with one another.

The first typology was the classical theory of four humours namely, blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile, attributed to Hippocrates and later on elaborated by Galen. This classification though erroneous in itself still survives in the works of Kretschmer, Sheldon and the modern endocrinologists who uphold the psycho-physical correspondence, the relation between physique and temperament. Kretschmer's pyknic, asthenic and athletic types find revision in Sheldon's classification into viscerotonia, cerebrotonia and somatotonia. This classification reveals marked relation between the physique and temperament. "His (Sheldon's) results are interesting but have not greatly impressed outsiders because of the lack of external confirmation....."

The body types seem to have a limited validity as tendencies which occur more often than not, but certainly they are not the clear cut discontinuities of the typologist's pipe dream"(18). Perhaps the most frequent criticism levelled at Sheldon's constitutional theory is that it is no theory at all(19).

Kretschmer's typology is of great psychiatric importance. The functional psychoses schizophrenia, he believed is more frequent among the aesthenics, and manic depressive more among the pyknics. Less extreme of these types are called schizoid or cycloid. According to this, schizophrenic and manic depressive are deviations from normality in strikingly opposite ways. But in reality it is not so. For though the personalities are different the patients sometimes have similar symptoms. What would be the place of diseases like paranoid, epilepsy in this classification? Secondly, according to Kretschmer character is innately determined, while it is not so. However, Kretschmer's work is of great practical value and has been rightly characterised as 'the paradigm of typological approach"(20).

18. Notcutt, B.: The Psychology of Personality.p.60.
 19. Hall, C. and Lindzey G.: Theories of Personality.
 p.271. (20) Bartlett F. and others: The Study
 of Society. p.232. London. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939

The Extroversion + intraversion theory of Jung(21) is an epic contribution to the psychology of personality. "Vigorously criticised and many times repudiated", writes G.W. Allport(22), "they (extroversion and intraversion) remain firmly rooted in the psychologist's store of concepts and have found their way into common speech. Probably neither the psychologists nor the layman can ever again do without them". Jung's division of mankind into introverts and extraverts coincide with two divergent outlooks towards life and the world. Extraversion and introversion is a liner variation. There are degrees of extroversion and intraversion which in extreme cases result into pathological illness, namely manic depressive and schizophrenia respectively. In common parlance an individual is an ambivert. Jung postulates four fundamental psychic functions viz. sensation, thinking, feeling and intuition. Hence, two main types are subdivided into eight types. To adduce Jung, "strictly speaking in reality there are no out right extroverts or

-
21. Jung, C. G. : Psychological Types. New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1923.
 22. Allport, G.W. : Personality - A Psychological Interpretation. New York, Henry Holt, 1937.p.419.

introverts, but extroverted and intraverted types such as thinking types, sensation types etc. (23)

Many typological concepts have been built around perceptual processes. Rorschach's classification into 'extratensive' and 'intratensive' is based on preference for colour movement, that of Kulpe on preference for colour ^{and form.} disintegrate. Spranger's division of personality types into six value types is also a valuable contribution to the typological literature.

D(2) Criticism :

One reason for the inconsistency and failure of the theories of typology is that perhaps there are no human types in the sense required by these investigators. The basic defeat in the trait and type approach to personality is that such studies state a biased^s and onesided^d truth. They study the individual in abstraction without reference to his social and cultural background. The standards of judgment^e and standards of measurement

23. Jung, C.G. : Psychological Types in Campbell (ed) Problem of Personality, London, Kegan Paul, 1925. p.295.

are comparative. An individual's behaviour good or bad, normal or abnormal, can be evaluated only in relation to the prevailing social standards.

Secondly, the measurement that an individual possesses a trait in more or less degree presupposes a definition of the criteria of deviation. There is nothing like a standardised normality of a trait common to all classes of the people. A trait is standard only in relation to the culture. It can be just defined in connection with a particular situation(24). For example, bravery in the abstract has little meaning as a character trait. It is a mode of response that functions in a specific cultural context. Its psychological significance must be interpreted with reference to the cultural background of the individual. Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb(25), after critically examining the concept of trait and its measurement observe that..... "in most respects personality is not a stable entity capable of being pinned to a table and analysed..... but that it interacts constantly with the situations in such a way as to make it difficult to talk about personality traits

24. Ogburn, W.F. and Nimkoff, M.F.: A Handbook of Sociology. London. Kegan Paul, 1947. p.100

25. Murphy, G., Murphy L. and Newcomb, T.M. : Experimental Social Psychology. New York, Harper 1937. pp. 872-73.

as inherent only in the organism. Let us consider however the hypothesis that personality as known is not simply organism but organism in a situation". Cantril(26) in his 'The Place of Personality in Social Psychology' criticising Allport's fad for psychological approach says, "Allport is introducing a bias and inevitably laying the groundwork for an abstract approach which is unable to handle adequately the problem of the role of the individual differences or personality characteristics in concrete social situation". The error of the whole trait and type approach is laid perhaps in treating people too much as separate entities, and describing man in isolation without including in description his relation to the environment.

IV. PERSONALITY THEORIES IN THE SCHOOLS OF PSYCHOLOGY

In scientific psychology there are various schools and trends of thought divided on their approach to various problems in psychology. These schools differ on basic theoretical grounds. Some-

-
26. Cantril, H. : The Place of Personality in Social Psychology, in Brand H.(ed.) The Study of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1954.p.120.

times the theories and conclusions are contradictory to each other also. Hormism, Behaviorism, Psychoanalysis and Gestalt are important among them. Individuals like Murray, Goldstein, Maslow, Angyal, Dollard and Miller, Rogers, Murphy and many others have contributed to the main flow of the thinking on personality. It is interesting as well as necessary to know the theories of personality developed by these schools and writers.

A. Pseudoscientific Methods of Judging Personality :

Previous to the scientific approach to personality study there were a wide variety of methods and techniques in judging and measuring personality. In these methods judgements were based on horoscopes, bumps on the head, physical characteristics and characteristics of hand writing. Systems were developed from these viz. astrology, phrenology, physiognomy, and graphology respectively. These methods are commonly called pseudoscientific methods, because at one time or another it was claimed that they were scientific when they were not". "By a piece of tragic irony", writes

J.C. Flugel(27), "phrenology was the most popular of all the doctrines of psychology in the whole of science and at the same time most erroneous". It is humorously said that bumps on a man's skull tell you more about the wife's character than his own. Yet these systems have still an appeal to the popular mind.

B(1). Hormic Theory of Personality :

Hormic theory is the theory of basic motives. Its basic principles are that behaviour is motivated, purposive and secondly, the motives are ~~in~~ⁱⁿⁿate and are called instincts.

There is a distinction between a basic trait and a basic motive. A trait is a quality of a whole person, while a motive is a term used for describing a particular action. If a motive constantly recurs in one person it would become more or less a trait. In a description of personality motive is considered not in isolation as a trait but in relation to some kind of stimulus situation.

27. Flugel, J. C. : A Hundred Years of Psychology. London, Ducksworth, 1945. p.42.

When we say that is an aggressive act' we are concerned with the motive, when we say 'that is an aggressive person' we refer to the trait.

McDougall has built up a systematic psychology of conation and affection. His hormic^{theory} of personality is a derivative of his theory of Instincts. In his classical volume 'An Introduction to Social Psychology' (1908) he first advocated the theory of instincts and its role in social life. According to him instincts are the prime movers of all behaviour, of humans and animals. They are a powerful force which has a great control over the mind of the individual. Individual's life processes and activities are an effort to satisfy these innate motives. McDougall held that instinctive forces are common to men of every race and of every age, but their strength differs in individuals of different social circumstances, for, different stages of culture favour or check them.

An instinct is a psychical fact, which combines in it the trio of cognitive, affective and conative tendencies of which the affective character is fundamental. Every major instinct has its chara-

characteristic emotion the arousal of which is an essential part of the behaviour.

Not only an instinct tends to become canalised in a particular direction or with reference to a particular object but various instincts become organised with reference to particular objects by means of sentiments. Sentiment, as defined by Shand, is an emotion centred around an object. Sentiment is a fact of mental structure and emotion a fact of mental functioning. It is this organisation into sentiments that brings order and consistency into our orrectic life.

Personality according to McDougall is an organisation of instincts into sentiments. But of particular importance is the sentiment of self-regard. It is a sentiment in which various instincts and emotions are organised around the idea of the self. A well integrated personality is that in which sentiments are organised into a hierarchical order with the self regarding sentiment in a supreme position. In dealing with personality as a whole he distinguished four main aspects of personality, viz. disposition, temper, temperament and character.

Disposition corresponds to the sum total of instinctive qualities and is determined by heredity. It also refers to the variation of native propensities in strength or urgency. Temper refers to the variation of all ways in which these propensities work towards their goals. Three aspects of temper were distinguished (a) the degree of perseverance, (b) intensity or emotionality, and (c) affectability. Temperament is defined as personal qualities that are determined by chemical influences of the bodily metabolism exerted upon the general working of the brain or nervous system. Character is the sum total of the acquired tendencies built up on the basis of disposition and temperament. In the highest type of character a strong self regarding sentiment prevails which is determined by some ideal of conduct.

Like McDougall there are many others who have sponsored the theory of basic motives in different forms. Thomas Reid's 'active powers', Dunlap's 'primary desires', Cattell's^{*} 'ergs', Murray's^{**} 'needs' are nearly equivalent to McDougall's 'instincts'.

* Cattell, R. B. : Introduction to Personality Study, London, Hutchinson, 1950. p

** Murray, H.A.: Explorating in Personality. N.Y. Oxford Press, 1938.

B(2) Criticism :

Though once popular and accepted the theory of instincts has not been left unassaulted. Severe criticisms have come from anthropologists and behaviorists. Anthropologists on the basis of their survey of primitive tribes pointing out to the varieties of human nature wipe out the idea of innate basis of personality and behaviour. Behaviorists accuse McDougall of trying to smuggle God and the soul back into psychology. F.H. Allport has argued that it is not possible for the infant with its undeveloped cortex to have any idea of the goal towards which its activities are held to be innately directed. The fact that no two adherents agree about the number of instincts has created a suspicion about the validity of the concept itself. Hence, R.E.L. Faris asks 'Are instincts data or hypothesis? The theory of instincts is simply a word magic. It is argument in circle.

The truth is that human motives are amazingly complex and can but seldom be traced back to a single instinct, which can be claimed to have survived in its original form. "In formation of man's personality and character", says Ginsberg(28), 28. Ginsberg, M. : The Psychology of Society. London, Methuen, 1951. p.12.

"it is not only the individual's inherited tendencies that are of importance. Social tradition supplies the medium in which we act and determine, through which different hereditary tendencies find satisfaction". Individual's potentialities find fulfillment in relation to his own experience and social environment. Hobhouse(29) writes in 'Mind in Evolution' that "what is hereditary is man's capacity, propensity, disposition but the capacities are filled in, the propensities encouraged or checked, the dispositions are inhibited or developed by mental interactions and the pervading influence of the circumbient atmosphere".

C. Stimulus - Response Theory :

There is no single S.R. theory but rather a cluster of theories. All theories resemble each other more or less but at the same time each possesses certain distinctive qualities. These systems started as attempts to explain the learning and retention of new forms of behaviour. Hence, the S.R. theorist gives more emphasis on the learning process. The researches of Ivan Pavlov, John B. Watson, Edward L., Thorndike have contributed a great deal in introducing this theory.

29. Hobhouse, L.T. : Mind in Evolution. London, Allen and Unwin. p.115.

C(1) Behavioristic Theory of Personality :

Physical science as the model, observation as the only method and behaviour as the subject matter, Behaviorism started its career in the beginning of the twentieth century. Watson the pioneer of Behaviorism said that, what is real is matter, and rejected the mentalistic concepts like consciousness, perception, imagination, thinking etc. from the field of psychology. Behaviour, he said, is strictly a response to a stimulus and can be explained in terms of the physical and chemical, muscular and glandular changes in the organism. In other words Behaviorists avoided the concepts of instinct, basic motives and mental traits. What is in the man is learned, result of training and conditioning.

According to this theory, personality is but the outgrowth of habits we form, an end product of our systems of habits. Personality is the sum total of activities that are discovered by actual observation of behaviour over a long time. In other words man is an assembled organic machine to run. "Let us mean by the term personality an individual's assets (actual and potential) and liabilities

(actual and potential) on the reaction time. By assets we mean first the total man of the organised habits, the socialised and regulated instincts, the socialised and tempered emotions, and the combinations and interrelations among them, and secondly, high coefficient both of plasticity and retention"(30).

This is the mechanistic view which sees no difference between the man and the machine. According to this view basically there is no difference between two individuals. Difference in personality is the result of difference in structure and early training. Watson asks the question, "Well, why does a boomerang return to the hand of its thrower? Because it is made in such a way that it must return?" Similarly the personality of an individual is what he is made to be. He(31) could "guarantee given a free hand in controlling the environment take any normal infant and train him any type of specialist, I might select, doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant chief and yes even beggar man, and regardless of his talents, penchant tendencies abilities, vocation and race of his ancestor". Our personality is thus the result of

30. Watson, J.B. : Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist. London, Lippincott, 1924.p.427.

31. Watson, J.B. : Behaviorism. London, Routledge, 1924. p.82.

what we start with and what we have lived through. It is a reaction mass as a whole. It is a mechanical print of the surroundings. Behaviorism, thus regards that person has nothing of his own but merely reproduces what is imposed on him from without.

C(2) Criticism :

The Behavioristic view of personality is not at all true and acceptable. Man is not a passive lump of clay which can be impressed upon and given any mould. It is no need to argue the existence of mental traits, special abilities and intelligence, and that individuals differ in them.

If the living organism is a machine composed of muscles, tissues, and nerve cells, there is no difference between the man and ^{the} robot. If it is so, the processes of training and conditioning can very well be extended to that robot. The robots are organised to react to electrical stimuli. They cannot be conditioned to react to any other stimulus instead. That is impossible because they lack what is present in the living organism viz. a 'mind'. If at all man is a machine, it is a machine with a purpose, a self regulating machine. His personality

is not a sum total of various activities. Its volume is not determined simply by adding up all that is contributed from all the sources. It is rather like a building, the structure of which may collapse upon the disappearance of a single element.

C(3) Among the S-R theories some theories are based on a principle concerned with reinforcement of reward. Others strongly emphasises contiguity or association. Edwin Guthrie's position is an example of contiguity or association type of theory. He regards all learning as based on conditioned reflex. Clark Hull's theory is an example of a reinforcement position. The outstanding example of crucial interest to personality psychologist is the theory of Dollard and Miller. The details of the theory developed by Dollard and Miller have been shaped by the formulations of Hull and also by psychoanalytic theory and findings of social anthropology.

Dollard and Miller have shown a great interest in learning and the process of development but have shown much less interest in the structural^t

elements of personality. Habit occupies the role of a link between stimulus and response. Dollard and Miller have defined the nature of motivation. They describe in details the development and elaboration of motives, drives. There are two kinds of drives, primary and secondary. The drives are usually linked to the physiological processes. The secondary drives which are learned drives are acquired on the basis of primary drives. The development of personality takes place through the derivation of the secondary drives from the primary drives and the process of learning.

C(4) Criticism :

The important contribution of S-R theories to the personality literature lies in the careful detail with which this position analyses and describes the learning process.

A critical objection to this theory is that it does not give first and adequate definition of stimulus and response. Most criticisms of S-R theory point to the simplicity and molecularity of the position. Holists describe this theory as segmental, fragmented and criticise its atomistic approach to

behaviour. "This theory has remarkably little to say about the structures or acquisitions of personality and this is undoubtedly why so many S-R theorists have found psychoanalytic theory useful in their thinking and investigation. This objection maintains that S-R theory is only a partial theory, it deals with the process of learning but not with its outcomes, and the relatively stable components of personality are an essential element in any attempt to understand human behaviour".(32)

D(1) Psychoanalytic Theory of Personality :

Psychoanalytic theory in psychology originated from the experiences and observations of Sigmund Freud of mentally insane persons. He developed upon the observations and laid down a few basic principles of human behaviour. Here we shall discuss psychoanalysis and its theory of personality as expounded by Freud and its followers known as orthodox psychoanalysts.

Principle of psychic determinism, concept of unconscious and psychological hedonism are ^{the} three

32. Hall, C. and Lindzey, Y.G. : Theories of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1957.p.462.

basic tenets of Freud's psychology. The Id, the Ego and the Super ego are the three major systems of which the personality is made of.

Behaviour is nearly always the product of an interaction among these three systems, rarely does one system operate to the ^cexclusion of the other two. In a very general way the id, the ego and the super ego may be thought of as the biological component, the psychological component and the social component of personality respectively.

Freud was probably the first psychological theorist to emphasise the developmental aspects of personality and the decisive role of the experiences in the early years of infancy and childhood in formation of the basic character structure of the person. Personality develops in response to four sources of tension. (i) physiological growth processes, (ii) frustrations, (iii) conflicts, and (iv) threats. As a direct consequence of increases in tension emanating from these sources the person is forced to learn new methods of reducing tension. This learning is what is meant by personality development.

Freud traces the formation of personality through the psycho-sexual development of the individual. He traces the growth of personality through dividing the years into age levels beginning way back with possible pre-natal and birth influences, and eventually reaching adult character structure.

The new born child is blessed with instincts, libido, an emerging differentiation of levels of awareness, a reservoir called id, and a condition described^{as} primary narcissism. The first year of the life is the oral stage. The small child is 'polymorphous perverse', that he is an instinctual creature dominated by undifferentiated loosely organised sexuality. Infantile sexuality is auto-erotic and comes to the fore through mouth. Second is called the anal stage in which the child gets pleasure in retaining and expelling his faeces. Between the age of three and five in the phallic stage the interest shifts to the genital. The child gets pleasure from masturbation and exhibitionism. Formation of oedipus complex and the anxiety resulting from the guilt laden feelings are the marks of this stage. Super-ego is the heir of the oedipus complex. In

girls at this stage penis envy arising from the observation of male and female genitals predominates.

In the childhood armed by a stronger ego and growing super-ego the child turns to new fields, schools, playmates, etc. This is the latency period in which sexual interests are presumed to be silent and behaviour tends to be dominated by sublimation and reaction formation. Puberty is the stage in which impulses once again break through accompanied by aggression, pre-genital symptoms and oedipal fantasies. At the adolescence the sexual energy becomes concentrated on genital feelings and heterosexual relations.

As a result of the growth through the various stages and experiences during the development there emerges an adult character structure. Every adult man or woman comes to acquire a particular constellation of traits. Though psychoanalytic theory tends to stress common patterns, the types of personality differ mainly on the basis of the individual's fixation at a particular stage. Accordingly, there are varieties of types, oral, anal, urethral, phallic, genital etc. The normal genital character is an ideal concept.

It is only through the history of infancy and childhood that the adult life gets its meaning. The studies of orthodox Freudians have subsequently pushed the emphasis back into the past. Rank(33) emphasised the traumatic significance of birth. According to him birth is an experience from which most people never recover. Klein(34) added other early developmental stages in the first and second years, building up a sinister dream world of naughty little babies.

D(2) Criticism :

Freud's theory of personality is not an all accepted dogma, and has been criticised severely by writers from all fields. No other psychological theory has been subjected to such searching and bitter criticism as has been psychoanalysis. Not only that many of his concepts are not universal, but also that they are not corroborated by factual evidence. Haldane(35) a physiologist holds that,

-
- 33. Rank, O. : The Trauma of Birth. London, Allen and Unwin, 1942.
 - 34. Klein, M. : Psychoanalysis of Children. London, Hogarth Press, 1932.
 - 35. Haldane quoted in Jastrow Josheph : Freud - His Dream and Sex Theories. New York, Pocket Books Inc.. Rocfeller Centre, 1948.

"The sort of organism which Freud imagines is a mere product of his imagination.... of the characteristic feature of conscious activity his conception gives no account at all..... The whole structure of any such psychology rests on bad physics and bad physiology besides being hopelessly inadequate from the special stand point of psychology. It misrepresents our actions because it misrepresents both our perceptions and passions." His concepts of libido and sublimation are erroneous and have been criticised by his own supporters. Freudian's excessive emphasis on sex and fixation at various age levels have been ridiculed by critics. Acquisitiveness, Freudians say is the result of lack of sufficient lip gratification during infancy, hence there is a witty statement that an antidote to capitalism would be a supply of feeding bottles to the capitalists. Secondly, some of the emotional experiences in infancy and childhood may have deep impressions on the personality but later learning and experiences in adolescence and adult age are equally powerful to modify those childhood impressions. Some of the key propositions about sexual development, especially statements about oedipus complex, latency period,

castration anxiety, penis envy and repression in children have been disconfirmed. "What appears to have happened is that Freud used his clinical data to produce universal generalisations and so overlooked how much learning can influence sexual development and how greatly cultural diversities can determine the sort of thing that is learnt"(36). The point has been made by various critics that Freud placed too much weight upon heredity and maturation and too little upon socially acquired features of personality.

D(3) Jung and Adler were the early deviants from the orthodox psychoanalytic theory.

Jung differed from Freud on many points, on the nature and number of instincts, the nature of unconscious, and less emphasis on repression. Jung defines libido more broadly as a primal energy underlying all mental life, not merely sexual. He posits two kinds of unconscious, personal and collective. His personality types are based on basic psychological functions, thinking, feeling

36. Farrell, Brian A.: The Scientific Testing of Psychoanalytic Findings and Theory in Brand H. (ed.) The Study of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1954. p.452.

sensation and intuition. This psychological types of Jung have been discussed in earlier pages.

The total personality or psyche as it is called by Jung consists of a number of separate but interacting systems. The principal systems are the ego, the personal unconscious and its complexes, the collective unconscious and its archetypes, the persona, the anima or animus and the shadow. Jung conceives of the personality or psyche as being a partially a closed system. It is said to be incompletely closed because energy is being added to and subtracted from the system. The energy is added, for example by eating, and energy is subtracted, for example by performing muscular work. The personality dynamics are subject to influences and modifications from external sources. It means that personality cannot achieve a state of perfect stabilisation, as it might, if it were a completely closed system. Jung puts emphasis on the forward going character of personality development. He believes that man is constantly progressing or attempting to progress from a less complete stage to a more complete stage of development.

Glover(37) ridicules the concept of archetypes as being metaphysical and incapable of proof. He believes that archetypes can be fully accounted for in terms of experience and that it is absurd to postulate racial inheritance. It has been criticised, that Jung's theory of personality has to contribute very little except for the word association test and the concepts of introversion-extraversion.

D(4) Alfred Adler emphasises the importance of early childhood for moulding the personality. In place of sexual component he stresses the universal feeling of inferiority. The inferiority feeling in the child originates because of his small size and helplessness which is perpetually developed because of the treatment from parents, family and society. To relieve his inferiority feelings the individual strives to be strong and powerful. "Inferiorities are never to be considered merely as handicaps but as the stimulus to compensation as pointers towards the goal of individual and racial development"(38).

37. Glover, E. : Freud or Jung. New York, Norton, 1950.

38. Way Lewis : Alfred Adler - His Psychology. Pelican Books 1956. p.80.

History is replete with instances of diverse compensatory strivings as modes of overcoming the handicaps resulting from the organic defects. The deaf Beethoven has left symphonies which are the marvels of music. Kepler, the astronomer was a victim of visual defects. Demosthenes had a speech defect.

Adler has been criticised for over emphasis and superficiality of his theoretical system, over simplification of the problem of neurosis and seeming neglect of unconscious factors.

D(5) Neo-Freudians :

There is another group of psychoanalysts called the neo-Freudians which consists of writers like Otto Fenichel, K. Horney, E. Fromm, Sullivan, A. Kardiner etc. Neo-Freudians have raised objections against issues like libido theory, Freud's metaphorical concepts and the orthodox emphasis upon early psycho-sexual development. They recognise the significance of biological needs, but reject the idea of libido as a driving force leading to the primary pursuit of erotic bodily satisfaction.

Instead they attempt "to understand the biological development of the child in terms of growth and interpersonal relations provided by the culture"(39).

Hall and Lindzey(40) write that among those who provided psychoanalytic theory with the twentieth century look of social psychology are the four people, Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, Erich Fromm and Harry Stack Sullivan. Alfred Adler may be regarded as the ancestral figure of the new social psychological look, because as early as 1911 he broke with Freud over the issue of sexuality, and proceeded to develop a theory in which social interest and a striving for superiority became two of its most substantial conceptual pillars. Later Horney and Fromm took up the cudgles against the strong instinctivist orientation of psychoanalysis and insisted upon the relevance of social psychological variables for personality theory. Finally, Harry Stack Sullivan in his theory of inter-personal relations consolidated the position of personality theory grounded in social processes.

39. Blum, G. S. : Psychoanalytic Theories of Personality. New York, McGraw Hill, 1952.p.16.

40. Hall, C. and Lindzey G. (ed.) : Theories of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1957.p.114-156.

The Neo-Freudians have underestimated the specific influence of child-parent relationship and overstressed the cultural factor. "It is an error called ethnological bias"(41). The personality descriptions given by various theorists show certain marked similarities. But the similarity is not the proof of validity. The agreement may be due to a widespread habit of borrowing ideas from each other.

E(1) Organismic Theory :

Organismic or holistic point of view is akin to the Gestalt movement. This view point has been expressed in the psychobiology of Adolf, Meyer, in psychosomatics and in the work of Coghill on the development of nervous system in relation to behaviour. The leading exponent of Organismic theory today is Kurt Goldstein, an eminent neuropsychiatrist. The salient features of the Organismic theory are its emphasis on the unity, integration, consistency and coherence of the normal personality. The theory states that the organism is an organised system and

41. Alexander, F. : Educative Influence of Personality Factors in Environment- in Kluckhohn C. Murray H. and Scheider, D.M.(ed.) Personality in Nature, Society and Culture. New York, A. A. Knopf, 1953. p.330.

analyses it by differentiating the whole into its constituent parts. It assumes that the individual is motivated by one sovereign drive and not by the plurality of drives. This sovereign motive is self-actualisation or self-realisation.

Goldstein says that the organism is a whole, which consists of differentiated members which are cast together. These members do not become detached and isolated from one another except under abnormal conditions. The primary organisation of organismic functioning is that of figure and ground. The main dynamic concepts of Goldstein are the equalisation process or the centering of the organism, self-actualisation and coming to terms with the environment.

Angyal has coined a new term the 'biosphere' to convey his conception of a holistic entity which includes both the individual and the environment. Goldstein distinguishes between the organism and the environment, while Angyal insists that it is impossible to differentiate the organism from the environment, for both are the aspects of a single reality. The

biosphere does not refer exclusively to somatic processes, but includes the psychological and social as well. Abraham Maslow in his book 'Motivation and Personality' has sided closely with an organismic view. He calls it a holistic-dynamic point of view. He feels that 'psychology has paid attention more to the weaknesses of man than to his good qualities and strengths. Psychology has explored his sins while neglecting his virtues. Maslow says that, man has an inborn nature which is essentially good and is never evil. As the individual becomes mature his personality unfolds and the potential goodness of man manifests itself more clearly. When man is wicked or miserable or neurotic, it is because the environment has made him so through ignorance and social pathology.

E(2) Criticism :

Organismic theory is a point of view against mind-body dualism, atomistic psychology and stimulus-response behaviorism. Very few psychologists today subscribe any longer to an atomistic view point. 'We are all organismic psychologists whatever else we may be'. "In this sense organismic theory is

more of an attitude or orientation or frame of reference than it is a systematic behaviour theory.... An organismic theory of personality is defined by the attitude of the theorist, not by the contents of the model of personality that is constructed.... There is little to find fault with in the organismic approach because it is so universally accepted. One can however evaluate a particular organismic theory such as Goldstein's or Angyal's"(42). Goldstein has been criticised for not distinguishing sufficiently between what is inherent in the organism and what has been put there by culture. His concept of self-actualisation is metaphysical and cannot be put to an experimental test. The concept of biosphere of Angyal which includes both the organism and its environment is not entirely successful in solving the problem of how to bring the person and the world into some kind of holistic union.

F(1) Gestalt Theory of Personality :

Max Wertheimer, Kurt Koffka and Wolfgang Kohler were the pioneers of a new revolutionary

42. Hall, C. and Lindzey, G. : Theories of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1957.p.329.

system of thought in psychology called Gestalt. Gestalt school rose as against the association and behavioristic psychology represented by Wundt and Watson respectively. It is opposed to the analytical and atomistic treatment of behaviour. It is a dynamic approach as against the historical and analytical approach. It is teleological and not causal. The teleology assumes a direction of events towards a goal and not in relation to the past. K. Lewin one of the chief supporters of this school says that in this dynamic approach, "instead of reference to the abstract average of as many historically given cases as possible there is reference to the full concreteness of the total situation"(43). Every event is individual and can be explained only in relation to the wholeness of the situation.

Kurt Lewin's theory of personality is representative of Gestalt psychology. According to him, "In the investigation of fundamental dynamic relation between the individual and the environment it is essential to keep constantly in mind the actual

43. Lewin, K. : A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York, McGraw Hill, 1936. p.38.

total situation in its concrete individuality"(44). He stresses the importance of understanding personality in terms of total situation. Total situation here means not the physical or geographical environment but the behavioural or psychological environment. Psychological environment is to be understood with reference to what the physical objects mean to the individual concerned. It depends upon the momentary needs and characteristics of the individual, and structure of the physical situation. There is a direct relation between the environment and needs and the object as the means of satisfaction of the need. "It leads fundamental change in the environment with the changing needs of the increasing age. Hence, exactly the same physical objects may have quite different sorts of psychological existence for different children and for the same children in different situation. A wooden cube may be one time a missile, again a building block and third time a locomotive"(45). Social facts also must be described

44. Lewin, K. : A Dynamic Theory of Personality.p.68.

45. Ibid., p.76.

like objective factors as they affect the particular individual.

The individual is dynamically a relatively closed system. Hence the effect of the environment upon the individual depends upon the functional firmness of the boundaries between the individual and environment. This firmness of the boundary is slighter in case of the child. Therefore, for a child there is slighter separation of real from unreal strata. The functional firmness between the self and environment depends not only upon the age but also upon the individual characteristics of the person.

Lewin's theory deals with personality as an integral whole and not as a patchwork of traits or as a statistical item.

F(2) Criticism :

The field dynamic theory is perhaps the only school which protests consistently against analysis. "But it is interesting to note that the defenders of personalism are attacking Gestalt Psychology on the ground that it is too analytical"(46).

46. Naidu, P.S. : The Hormic Theory. Allahabad, Central Book Depot, 1947, p.112.

It tries to solve the problem of subjectivity by objectifying it. Secondly, the field theory has been described as the psychology of functional analysis. It has no explanatory value. It has not been able to answer the questions, "How do organisations come into existence? How are the configurations produced? What is the urge to the formation of 'Gestalten'?" Closeness, nearness etc. are merely descriptive terms. The shortcoming of Lewin's theory as pointed out by Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb(47) is that "the aesthetic satisfaction of envisaging the organism as a whole interfere with the discovery of confused, inchoate and incomplete phases of the person". Hall and Lindzey(48) summarise the criticism against Lewin's theory under four headings. Lewin's topological and vectorial representations do not bring forth anything new about the behaviour they are supposed to explain. Secondly, Lewin puts too much emphasis on the meaning which

47. Murphy, G., Murphy, L. and Newcomb, T.M. : Experimental Social Psychology, New York, Harper Bros., 1947. p.881.

48. Hall, C. and Lindzey, G. : Theories of Personality. New York, John Wiley, 1957. pp. 248-254.

individual has of the objective environment. Individual's meaning is important but psychology cannot ignore the objective environment itself. Floyd Allport believes that Lewin has confused the physical with the psychological. Thirdly, Lewin does not take into account the past history of the individual. Fourthly, Lewin misuses physical and mathematical concepts. The most severe criticism that has been made of Lewin's field theory is that it pretends to offer a mathematical model of behaviour from which specific predictions can be made, when in fact no such predictions can be formulated.

G(1) Murray's Personology :

Henry A. Murray's theory combines in it the influences of biological science, clinical practices and academic psychology. His theory shows respect for the biological factors as determinants. It has full appreciation for the individual complexity of the human organism. The focus of Murray's theory is based upon the individual in all his complexity and this point of view is described by the term 'personology'.

Murray's views on the structure of personality have been influenced by psychoanalytic theory, but at the same time they are different from an orthodox Freudian view. 'Personality is the hypothetical structure of the mind. It finds expression through the internal and external processes which constitute a person's life. Personality is the governing organ of the body. It is an institution which from birth to death is constantly engaged in transformative functional operations. Murray in his writings has emphasised the physiological ground of personality. He writes that personality may be biologically defined and that it is located in the brain. No brain, no personality. Infantile complexes, socio-cultural determinants, unconscious processes, uniqueness of the individual and the socialisation process contribute towards the development of personality. Murray's attempts suggest that he is of a view which gives weight to the part of the organism, to the organising function of personality, to the recurrent and novel features of the individual's behaviour, and to the physiological processes underlying the psychological.

G(2) Criticism :

The main criticisms of the theory are related to the originality and the complexity of the theory. Murray has devoted more time to the motivational process than he has to the learning process. This has led to the criticism that the theory suffers from an inability to account for the manner in which motives become transformed and develop. Hall and Lindzey(49) point out that this theory does not lead to research. There is a set of concepts and a related set of empirical definitions, but that there is no set of explicitly stated psychological assumptions linked to these concepts in such a manner as to produce testable consequences.

H. Murphy's Biosocial Theory :

Murphy calls his theory of personality a biosocial approach, because he conceives of man as a biological organism, which maintains a reciprocal relationship with its material and social environment. Personality is the product of a bipolar process, one pole lying within the body, the other

49. Hall, C. and Lindzey, G. : Op.cit., p.202.

pole in the outer world. In Murphy's words, "man is a nodal region, an organised field within a larger field, a region of perpetual interaction, a reciprocity of outgoing and incoming energies" (50). Murphy's approach rests on the field of theory as its base. He differs from Lewin in the emphasis that he placed upon the biological foundations of personality.

Murphy defines structure as the way in which the parts forming a whole are articulated or put together. Biosocial theory is eclectic, functional, holistic and a field theory. It is eclectic for it takes into account all aspects of the individual and his environment and all branches of psychology. Murphy's eclecticism does not consist in merely putting all the different aspects together. He is creative and has organised the material in a novel manner. He has opened new ways of viewing personality.

Murphy lays down four principal basic components of personality. (i) physiological dispositions, (ii) canalisations, (iii) conditioned

50. Murphy, G. : Personality - A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structures. New York, Harper, 1947. p.7.

responses, and (iv) cognitive and perceptual habits. These components are relatively constant. In conjunction with a relatively stable environment they give continuity to personality.

The three stages of development of personality are the global stage, the differentiated stage and the integrated stage. The stages describe how from the diffused energy and undifferentiated parts gradually emerge an integrated, interrelated system of separate parts and diffused energy. "Personality is a flowing continuum of organism environment events"(51).

Criticism :

'To evaluate Murphy's biosocial approach to personality and to say what its status is, in the contemporary scene presents some difficulties. Biosocial theory has not been a rallying ground nor has it been a battle field"(52).

I. Criticism of the Psychological Theories of Personality :

A survey of personality theories reveals

51. Murphy, G. : Op.cit., p.21.

52. Hall, C. and Lindzey, G. : Op.cit., p.532.

a few points common to most of the theories. One, the importance of conceiving of the human organism as a striving, seeking, purposive creature is less central today than it was twenty or thirty years before. Instead of talking about 'purpose' in general the tendency is to discuss specific problems concerning such matters, as the role of reward, the importance of the 'self' and the significance of unconscious motivation'. Secondly, in recent years the importance of the unconscious determinants of behaviour as opposed to the conscious determinants is being emphasised. But there is a great deal of variety among the theorists in the extent to which this role is emphasised. There seems to be a growing tendency to deal explicitly with the issue of reward either assigning it central importance or else subordinating it to other principles. Association, the temporal and spatial linking of two events is less explicitly emphasised than reward. Personality theorists seem to be evenly ~~in development~~ divided on the significance of events taking place early in development. One of the features that distinguished personality theory historically from other varieties

of psychological theory was an emphasis upon holism. The importance of field is also emphasised by Angyal, Lewin, Murphy, Murray and Sullivan. The significance of the psychological environment of the world of experience as opposed to the world of physical reality is accepted by most personality theorists.

As a deviation from the historical and analytical trend in the study of personality there is a growing tendency to consider the importance of group membership determinants. "The psychologists naturally lay stress on the psychological factors in respect of formation of personality. Of late however the necessary emphasis on the cultural environment has also occurred" (53). This trend of thinking has been emphasised by those who have been influenced by Sociology and Anthropology. Illustrative of this position are Horny, Fromm, Miller and Dollard, Murphy, Murray, Sullivan. "Most of these efforts centre about the possibility of interpreting psychological concepts with the findings of concepts of biological sciences. What is needed more today is the recognition of importance of social and

53. Chattopadhyaya : Personality and Culture in the Indian Journal of Psychology, Vol. XXXII, 1957. p.69.

cultural factors in the determination of personality of the individual. The researches in Sociology and Anthropology have falsified and clarified many of the Psychologist's concepts about human mind and nature. The psycho-physical structure with which a man is born plus the sub-culture in which he spends his early life and youth - determine personality traits"(54). So a personality theorist cannot ignore the social, cultural determinants of personality. The disciplines of Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology should join hands in building up an approach to personality study.

V. SOCIOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF PERSONALITY

Sociologists and Anthropologists are another group of thinkers who eventually discuss the 'personality' of the individual.

Study of society is the central problem for sociologists. As in the ultimate analysis society is formed of individuals the study of individual becomes one of the topics. Thus to a Sociologist

54. Chattopadhyaya : Op.cit., p.70.

the study of the individual is secondary. 'Personality' defined by ^{the} sociologists, "is the totality of those aspects of behaviour which give meaning to an individual in society and differentiate him from other members of the community, each of whom embodies countless cultural patterns in a unique configuration"(55). "The sociological concept creates personality as a gradually cumulative entity"(56). Personality ~~to~~ them is a product of environment. It attempts to derive some of the characteristics of human beings from their membership of the groups without the intervention of psychology. According to such theories man's actions are not the expression of his motives but rather the social situations, in which he is placed. Personality is the totality of actions. There is no importance given to individual's biological and psychological forces behind his actions. Sociologists think that since motives are fairly constant and universal in their action, they can be neglected. Karl Marx's theories are examples of such sociological thinking. The psychologist who believes in psychical determinism considers such

55. Sapir, E. : Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences.
Vol. XII, p.85.

56. Ibid., p. 86.

sociological theories to be obscure and paradoxical. It is misleading to believe that the totality has the qualities quite different from and which are not in its parts. If the individual's actions are purposive how can their aggregate acquire entirely a different meaning? A total group cannot show characteristics that are not derived from those of individual members. Such a fallacy of thinking and ignorance of psychology is apparent in the sociologist's concept of 'group mind'. The sociologists think that the mind of society, group, is different and above the mind of the individual. When a group comes into existence an individual ceases to exist. This fallacy has been revealed by the psychologists who think that the mind of the group, society can be analysed in terms of the psychology of the individual.

Most of the Marx's statements were incorrect and the concept of 'economic man' groundless because they were based on wrong notions of human behaviour. How can there be a sociology that cuts itself loose from psychology?

It was sociologist's fashion to describe society in terms of its structure but that must not neglect the individual. Attempts have been made to reconcile the sociology and psychology, - the theory of social structure and ^{the} theory of motives. In old writings such efforts have been made by Plato in the Republic. He has described the structure of the individual soul by analogy with the structure of the state. In modern writings such attempts seem to have been made by K. Horney(57) and E. Fromm(58).

VI. ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO PERSONALITY

Anthropology studies the 'man', the Homo-sapiens. Social and cultural anthropology studies the structure and evolution of culture and its impact on human life. Earlier theories of social anthropology i.e. of cultural determinism emphasised the transmission of beliefs and customs, and then grew up the theories which explained the central traits of personality in terms of cultural influences.

57. Horney, K. : The Neurotic Personality, ^{of} Our Time. London, Kegan Paul, 1936.

58. Fromm, E. : Escape from Freedom. New York, Rinehart, 1941.

The theories of cultural determinism are the result of sincerity and integrity of the scientist. Anthropologists thought to explore the varieties of 'human nature', that no people are superior or inferior, no race is god's blessed child.

Anthropologists regard man as so largely a creature of circumstances that his beliefs, morals and actions could hardly be considered his own. 'Personality' defined Faris, 'is the subjective side of culture'. Hence an individual is nothing more than a creature of his circumstances. He is being moulded and is in moulding by the cultural atmosphere around him. Such definitions of personality consider the individual a mechanical carrier of the impressions of cultural beliefs and customs. They also disregard the individual differences in basic drives, abilities and capacity for assimilating personal - social conditioning. Moreover, such theories do not go deep. They merely describe and do not explain. Any such theory of personality is simply a set of pre-suppositions about human nature.

Anthropological studies are valuable in the sense that they have made an important contribution in the field of the sciences of human nature. They

have produced a scientific evidence for the 'inequality of man'. They reveal that the structure of cultures differ in different societies, and differences in cultural pattern give rise to peculiar differences in people of different societies. So individuals reared in different societies differ in their personality structure. An American is an American because he is brought up and bred in American culture and a Bushman is not an American because he is not brought up in that pattern of life. Major differences in personality derive from differences in culture.

Criticism :

"Personality always represents a particular configuration of cultural patterns and its own unique characteristics"(59). Anthropologists' studies lack one thing, the importance of the individual. In their zest to analyse differences in cultural pattern they have ignored the carriers of culture. Individual is an active (and not a passive) carrier of culture. Culture moulds the individual,

59. Young, K. : A Hand Book of Social Psychology. London, Kegan Paul, 1946. p.41.

similarly the initiative of the individual causes changes in the features of culture, and hence change in the cultural patterns. It is also a fact that people in the same society or family are not entirely alike. There is a reason why individuals in a particular society are ready to accept one and reject another innovation.

Individuals are not completely moulded to a common pattern despite the forces at work which tend to produce the similarities. "Culture is not a die which stamps out succeeding generations of individuals indistinguishable in all their habits and beliefs. It defines ends for which individuals strive and at the same time provides correlative means for accomplishing them, for gratifying human desires within gradational limits"(60). To understand this we must turn to the findings of psychology. Seligman(61) states that, he has become convinced that the most fruitful development, perhaps indeed the only process that can bring social anthropology to

60. Hallowel, A.I. : Hand Book of Psychological Leads for Ethnological Field Workers. Northwestern University, 1935. p.43.

61. Seligman, C.G.: Introduction to J.S. Lincoln's "The Dream in Primitive Cultures. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952. p.ix.

its rightful status as a branch of science and at the same time give it full weight in human affairs, to which it is entitled is the increased elucidation in the field and integration into anthropology of psychological knowledge".

VII. INDIVIDUAL, SOCIETY AND CULTURE

The individual with his needs and potentialities lies at the formation of all social cultural phenomena. His physique is the basis of all organic and psychical needs and processes. His needs are satisfied with constant reference to the experience which he meets in the social and cultural milieu.

Society is a functional operative unit which works as a whole. There is a kind of organisation in which the activities necessary to the survival of the whole are divided and distributed among the members. The formal division of activities of the individuals according to various classes and status give the society structure, organisation and cohesion. Culture is a code of life prescribed by

the society and provides the clues to the individual as how to satisfy the organic and psychic needs. Without participation in the culture, no individual can arrive at the threshold of his potentialities.

The culture is an indispensable guide in all the affairs of life. Hence, in spite of differences in ^{the} individual's abilities and capacities he will respond to a certain situation in typically the same way. Because the individuals in society behave in a definite way in a definite situation as prescribed by the society it is possible for us to predict the behaviour of ^{the} people. When an individual goes to a foreign land he feels like a fish out of water until he assimilates the local habits of living. It simply means that in any society things are organised in terms of local cultural patterns and departures from them are very few.

The individual is a producer as well as a carrier of the culture. The individual learns the cultural patterns and they are transmitted from generation to generation. Individuals by doing so perpetuate the pattern of our befitting various